Propaganda Analysis

VOLUME I OF THE PUBLICATIONS OF THE

INSTITUTE FOR PROPAGANDA ANALYSIS, INC.

October, 1937 to October, 1938

WITH NEW MATERIALS TO AID

STUDENT AND ADULT GROUPS IN THE ANALYSIS

OF TODAY'S PROPAGANDAS

INSTITUTE FOR PROPAGANDA ANALYSIS, INC.

130 MORNINGSIDE DRIVE, NEW YORK, N.Y.

1938

INSTITUTE FOR PROPAGANDA ANALYSIS, INC.

OFFICERS

President, E. C. LINDEMAN, New York School of Social Work

Vice President, KIRTLEY MATHER, Harvard University

Treasurer, NED H. DEARBORN, New York University

Executive Secretary, CLYDE R. MILLER, Teachers College, Columbia University

ADVISORY BOARD

FRANK E. BAKER, Milwaukee State Teachers College

CHARLES A. BEARD

HADLEY CANTRIL, Princeton University

EDGAR DALE, Ohio State University

LEONARD DOOB, Yale University

PAUL DOUGLAS, University of Chicago

GLADYS MURPHY GRAHAM, University of California at Los Angeles

F. ERNEST JOHNSON, Teachers College, Columbia University

GRAYSON N. KEFAUVER, Stanford University

WILLIAM HEARD KILPATRICK

ROBERT S. LYND, Columbia University

MALCOLM S. MACLEAN, University of Minnesota

ERNEST O. MELBY, Northwestern University

JAMES E. MENDENHALL, Lincoln School, New York City

ROBERT K. SPEER, New York University

Preface

THIS volume is a guide to the understanding of the many propagandas assailing Americans today and certain to assail them, perhaps with increasing force, in the immediate future. It comprises studies published since October, 1937 by the newly organized Institute for Propaganda Analysis. It contains hitherto unpublished analytical suggestions which should be of particular and timely help to individuals, to members of adult groups and of college and high school classes who want to know how to recognize propaganda and analyze it.

In the world today there is conflict between two faiths: that of the democrat, who holds that man is an end in himself, that everything worthwhile in life depends on respect for the individual, on justice, and on friendly intercourse among men of all kinds; and that of the new dictators, glorying in power and war, hating and despising the "humanitarian weakness" of democracy. The creed of the dictators is dangerously attractive to many; in it there is none of the "drudgery of hard thinking" demanded by democracy, but a simple faith, a career of adventure, excitement, and self-sacrifice in some "great and glorious cause."

The first principle of action in a dictatorship is to weld a powerful propaganda machine with which to bring all the people "into line," to transform them into selfless automatons existing only for the greater glory of the state. The first principle of action in a democracy is that all of its mature members understand the decisions they make, and share in the making of them. From this it follows that there must be no barriers to the carrying on of government by the consent of the governed. It is essential in a democratic society that young people and adults learn how to think, learn how to make up their minds. They must learn how to think *independently*, and they must also learn how to think *together*. They must come to conclusions, while at the same time recognizing that other men, for whom they have affection and respect, are coming to opposite conclusions. So far as individuals are concerned, the art of democracy is the art of thinking and discussing independently together.

But there are factors in a democratic society which sometimes militate against the best use of discussion. Walter Lippmann indicated some of these when he wrote, "The private citizen today has come to feel rather like a deaf spectator in the back row. . . . [Public affairs] are managed, if they are managed at all, at distant centers, from behind scenes, by unnamed powers." What are these powers, and whose invisible hands pull the strings which make things happen? And why do we "think" and act and vote in prescribed ways when certain strings are pulled?

This situation is a far cry from Aristotle's belief in the wisdom of collective humanity, from Horace Mann's faith in the "free play of intelligence."

The challenge to democracy which the world offers today is for our American democracy to keep on making its own decisions, to make ever-wiser decisions concerning our problems, and to keep on inviting free, even if dangerous, choice. The fascination of democracy is that it is so often at the crossroads, there are so many propagandists pointing out the direction we should take. The disappointment about dictatorships is that they seem to promise stability and security, but so often end with decisions which do not yield security – decisions which crush the individuals concerned and drive on to the annihilation in war of society itself.

The corrective which Americans increasingly see that they must put to the weaknesses of their democracy – to the temptation to take too much of their thinking ready-made from others – is education. In a non-democratic state the lack of educational opportunity will cause great loss in countless ways to individuals, and ultimately to the state. But the stability of the state will not be directly affected. To a democratic state, education is a vital necessity; for, without it, it is as if a man who had no knowledge of how to handle machinery and whose mistakes would spell wide disaster were placed in charge of a complicated and rather dangerous machine.

The world today is the victim of a system of subtle and ceaseless propaganda – suppressing, exaggerating, distorting. Backgrounds are established against which identical facts ap-

pear so different as to be almost unrecognizable, and the task of finding solutions for difficulties is rendered infinitely more complex by the fact that in the modern world we can know only a few things from experience, we must depend upon "authorities," upon what we read and hear for our knowledge. We must depend on those who supply the news or other material for judgment. The work of educators in a democratic society must be continually to emphasize to the general body of citizens their duty to *search out for themselves* the matters on which it is the function of citizenship to form opinions and record decisions.

Increasingly since the World War, and especially during the last decade, the citizenry of this country has come to recognize the importance of recognizing propaganda and of understanding the rôle which it plays in their lives. The Institute for Propaganda Analysis, organized in October 1937, was established as a non-profit, educational institution to analyze the propagandas of today and to formulate methods whereby American citizens can make their own analyses of "attempts to persuade them to do something that they might not do if they were given all of the facts."

In a democracy, freedom of speech necessarily means freedom to propagandize; and this freedom implies the obligation resting upon citizens to analyze propaganda affecting their interests, and the interests of the community.

"There are three possible ways to deal with propaganda," it was pointed out in the October, 1937 letter of the Institute. "You can suppress it, meet it with counter-propaganda, or analyze it and try to see how much truth there is in it. We are going to analyze it." With this explanation and with the help of a ten thousand dollar grant from The Good Will Fund of the late Edward A. Filene, the Institute began its work. During the first year of its existence, its staff published fifteen letters of propaganda analysis, widely circulated among educators and laymen.

This volume is made up of those fifteen brief studies of current propaganda, as well as "News from Europe," the initial study of the Institute's second year. Included also are new materials, consisting of discussion suggestions and study outlines, to aid adult and student groups in the analysis of today's propaganda. This volume should, therefore, be of value not only to the individual citizen but especially to students, teachers, and adults who use the Institute's October, 1938 publication, *The Group Leader's Guide to Propaganda Analysis,* prepared by Miss Violet Edwards, its educational director.[1] Students and adults using this volume and *The Group Leader's Guide to Propaganda Analysis* may wish to supplement both with the Institute's "Survey of Opinion" tests, prepared with the assistance of Mr. Edward Glaser.

Basic to propaganda analysis is an alert and critical but an emotionally-detached examination[2] of controversial issues and of the opinions which flow from them — opinions which usually carry a high charge of emotion. Basic, too, to the process of propaganda analysis are free discussion and the expression of many points of view by all members of a study group. Most of us know only too well that it is easy to submit, to obey, to conform, or to "call names" ourselves, but that it is far harder to join with others in discussion of common problems and to reach decisions on the basis of recognition of the problems themselves and on reckoning with the relevant facts.

Without the interest and coöperation of many able friends the Institute could not have carried on the work of its first year. We regret that the names of all these persons and groups cannot be mentioned here. A few, however, must be recorded, so great have been their contributions.

The Institute is particularly grateful to the late Edward A. Filene for his interest and support, and to members of the Good Will Fund board who seek to realize the goals of Mr. Filene's social vision.

[1] *The Group Leader's Guide to Propaganda Analysis* supplants the Institute's publication of January, 1938, *Propaganda—How to Recognize It and Deal with It,* which, with its study suggestions and materials, was used in a nation-wide experimental study program, participated in by more than 400 high schools, colleges, and universities.

[2] It follows, of course, that in such study we retain an emotional drive for clarity of thought, for solving the problem at hand. We also utilize this emotional drive to realize in beneficial action the facts revealed by clear thinking. For example, men and women have had all-consuming emotional drives to eliminate smallpox, typhoid, and cancer. To achieve their ends in research they kept in check irrelevant emotions. And, finally, with facts in hand they, with the help of others, have given to millions of people the emotional drive to accept the facts concerning these diseases and to act in accordance with those facts.

Without the interest and able assistance of its own Advisory Board, the Institute's first volume of propaganda analysis and study materials could not have been realized.

The Institute acknowledges the extensive experimental work carried on in coöperating high schools, colleges, and universities throughout the country, which made possible many of the fine study suggestions in this volume. Among those institutions are the following: University experimental high schools of Teachers College, Columbia University (especially the Horace Mann School); of Northwestern University; of Ohio State University; of Stanford University; of Milwaukee State Teachers College; of Colorado State College of Education.

Public high schools of Rock Island, Illinois; of Clayton, Missouri; of Manhattan, Kansas; of Newark, New Jersey (especially the Weequahick High School); of Gloversville, New York; of Bronxville, New York; of Pasadena, California; and of Honolulu, Hawaii.

College classes of Stephens College, Mills College, the University of Missouri, Illinois State Teachers College, Ohio State University, Northwestern University, Pasadena Junior College, Colorado State College of Education, and many others.

The Institute is greatly indebted for their coöperation to such organizations (and their individual members) as the following: The Progressive Education Association, the Stanford University Language Arts Investigation, the Denver and Pasadena Boards of Education.

Grateful acknowledgment is made also to Mr. Charles A. Seidle, of Lehigh University, formerly assistant to the secretary of the Institute, for his able assistance in the editing of the monthly issues of PROPAGANDA ANALYSIS and of the discussion notes for this volume; to Harold Lavine, now editorial director of the Institute, for assistance in preparing several studies; to Professor George W. Hartmann, of Columbia University, and to Professor John G. Pilley, of Wellesley College, formerly of Bristol University, England, for their helpful counsel; to Miss Helen I. Davis, of DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City, for critical reading of manuscripts; and to Professor Robert A. Brady, of the University of California, for material of great value in the Institute's analysis of German Fascist propaganda.

Finally, for methods and suggestions for bringing about group study, discussion, and follow-up activities, the Institute and its members are particularly indebted to Miss Violet Edwards and to Mr. Frank Walser. In preparing this valuable material, which should do much to make the monthly letters not only arouse but sustain constructive follow-up study and well-balanced free discussion, Mr. Walser has drawn upon his extensive work and research in the field of group discussion with adults and with young people.

CLYDE R. MILLER
Secretary

Institute for Propaganda Analysis, Inc.
New York City
October 15, 1938

Contents

Introduction

GENERAL SUGGESTIONS

THE study and analysis of propaganda is a new field filled with useful possibilities, a challenge to the resourceful group leader or teacher. Here are a few suggestions. All who engage in this study are invited to send further suggestions to the Institute for Propaganda Analysis. Thus a body of useful and tried methods may be built up gradually.

There are two main ways by which the student of propaganda can educate himself in the mental alertness and independence of thought needed to recognize and deal with propaganda: First, he should study and analyze the propaganda he sees most closely. Second, he should observe himself and his friends engaging consciously or unconsciously in propaganda when discussing some vital controversial problem.

A. *Studying and analyzing propaganda:*

1. Members of the discussion group may collect useful data on the propaganda devices used in their own homes, communities, and organizations, in large national groups.
2. To do this the work may be divided according to the members' particular interests. Some may wish to study the propaganda effects of the movies, news reels; radio programs, news commentators; newspaper cartoons, editorials, columnists, advertisements; periodicals; public relations counsels. Others may wish to study the propaganda effects of educational meetings, concerts, lectures, churches; school clubs, student activities; text books, novels, etc.
3. Each member of the discussion group should keep a work book on propaganda. In it he should paste newspaper items, editorials, cartoons, radio scripts, theatre programs, advertisements, copies of or excerpts from speeches, etc., underlining words and phrases and noting specifically how these have been used for propaganda.
4. The whole group can participate in writing and giving short dramatic sketches in which thought-provoking propaganda appears for both of two opposed points of view.

B. *Propaganda in discussion of controversial issues:*

1. Members of the group should be urged to respect mutual criticism.
2. Short questionnaires concerning the main issues of the discussion should be answered before and again following the discussion.
3. Occasionally in the midst of a heated argument, the discussion should be stopped suddenly and the attention of the group turned to the diverse attitudes expressed by the members and the reasons for this diversity.
4. Similar in intent is the writing of a short "intellectual autobiography." After the third or fourth meeting each member of the group should be urged to write such an autobiography indicating as honestly and fairly as possible what beliefs (political, economic, social, religious) he holds and why (from whom did he get them, how long has he held them, what are his best reasons for continuing to hold them). Tentative theories and major issues about which one has not yet reached a decision should also be indicated. These autobiographies need not be shown to other members of the group, although greater value comes from frankly discussing them.
5. Two or three members of the group may observe the discussion from an inconspicuous place and later report for discussion the propaganda devices used by participants.
6. In every discussion an effort should be made to avoid "either-or" solutions. Seek additional alternative solutions.
7. Each discussion group should keep minutes or a log of discussions. Record the members present, the subject discussed, the major issues raised, the alternative solutions offered, the consensus (if one is reached), the prevalence of propaganda devices in the members' presentations of their points of view, special assignments, and further suggestions.

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE DISCUSSION LEADER

Whatever the discussion leader may personally believe, he should allow every member of the group to do *his own thinking*. This may require time and patience, but in the long run it is the only effective method.

It is wise for different members of the group to take turns leading the discussion. Again, this may take more time, but it is valuable experience which every member who is willing and able should have. It makes the individual member see more clearly the purpose of a discussion and it makes him a better participant in other discussions.

It is not an easy matter to lead a discussion.

The discussion leader should approach his task humbly and with much preparation both in the techniques of discussion leading and in the subject under consideration.

The suggestions below and the following section on discussion outlines are particularly intended to help discussion and group leaders, teachers, students, and participants in discussions. A bibliography for additional study of the techniques of discussion leading is appended at the end of this introduction. It should be remembered that these suggestions are only to help the discussion leader get started. After the discussion gets under way, he must be alert to all that is being said and to some things which are not said. At all times he must be courteous and helpful, even when he is restricting the time of a member who has spoken too frequently or who is beginning to repeat himself.

Here are four specific suggestions for discussion leaders:

1. One way of "warming up" the group is by using questions and getting the members to hunt up facts impartially. Thus with tact and skill the leader furthers the individual's thinking process. In no way should he invite or suggest certain conclusions, although he may, when asked, volunteer his own opinion at the conclusion of the discussion.
2. When a discussion is based on a set of questions, as those following each section in this book, the whole list should not be read aloud at the beginning, but should be presented one at a time with such improvised additions as may stir the group's imagination and interest.

   The questions and suggested activities listed in this volume have been carefully prepared with a certain sequence. The leader should be thoroughly familiar with them before beginning the discussion. Nothing will help him so much as foresight and careful planning in advance. More questions and suggestions are proposed for each section than can adequately be covered in one or two meetings. If possible, a sufficient number of meetings should be scheduled to cover them all; if not, the discussion leader should choose the items most pertinent for his group.
3. Keep in mind the purpose of this whole study. It is not to agree or even to arrive at a conclusion (although these are valuable), but to develop independent, critical minds which shall be strong in the face of the contrary winds and confusion of prejudice.
4. During a discussion the members of the group jointly explore a given issue. One of the chief tasks of the discussion leader is to see that the discussion remains on the main highway. It is always interesting to explore by-paths; and the group may decide that this is what it wants to do. But usually it is much better to keep the main issue and its development before the members. If a digression is felt advisable, the leader should be entirely conscious of the changed direction the discussion is taking.
5. A discussion develops much as a pattern develops in weaving. The discussion outline which the leader has in mind might be thought of as the warp on a loom or the first threads. The contributions to the discussion might be thought of as the weft or the cross threads woven into the warp to complete the pattern. The discussion leader is the weaver who sees the whole pattern, weaves the different parts together, and finds a place for each contribution. He does this by constantly reviewing and summarizing the points which have been made, by clarifying and defining conflicting issues and opinions, and by raising questions about parts of the discussion which he believes should be pursued further.
6. One of the things that can most help discussion to be vital and meaningful is to support it and follow it with action. For instance, if before the first discussion of propaganda every member has first asked five people for a definition of propaganda, this preliminary activity will almost certainly insure a good discussion. As for follow-up action, particular propagandas might be studied and reported at the second meeting.

PREPARATION AND USE OF A DISCUSSION OUTLINE

An outline is a kind of chart or blue-print of the way in which a particular subject will be developed. The author of an article, the deliverer of a speech, the leader of a discussion should prepare a careful outline of his subject. The author fills in his outline by writing a complete article. The lecturer fills in his outline as he speaks. The discussion leader need not and should not follow his outline so closely as the author and speaker. But for himself his outline is just as necessary.

Here are the main purposes of a discussion outline:

The primary value of a discussion outline is to help the leader foresee some of the problems and comments which may be presented by the group. It is a way of thinking through the whole issue, of preparing one's self to direct the discussion and to relate to each other and to the main parts of the subject the various contributions from the members of the group.

The secondary value is that the leader will have before him a framework for the development of the

subject. This framework or outline will contain some of the points which he believes will be and should be raised for a careful consideration of the subject. He should be cautioned, however, to remember that the outline is only his approach, that the purpose of the discussion is to share opinions and not to have him lecture. The purpose of the discussion outline, therefore, is to help the leader see the problem more clearly and so to lead the discussion more expertly.

In preparing a discussion outline and in helping the members of a discussion group think through solutions for a given problem or set of issues, the following twelve steps have been found helpful in actual practice and should greatly aid new discussion leaders, teachers, and students. There are other theories about discussion leading and other ways of making outlines. These suggestions are made to help the untried discussion leader get started. He is strongly urged to consult the bibliography at the end of the introduction, to observe critically other discussion leaders, and, most important of all, constantly and critically to study his own methods for ways of improving them.

1. *State the problem or issue clearly.*

The group usually chooses the general area for discussion. In preparing his outline the leader should state the issue or problem very clearly. This may take the form of a question or of a declarative sentence. For instance, the group may have decided to discuss "Good Propaganda." The leader must find an issue in this area. He might choose "Good Propaganda Is the Same As Education." In stating the issue remember that facts as facts cannot be discussed; only opinions can be discussed. The best issue is one about which the different members of the group have strongly conflicting opinions.

2. *Explore different definitions and statements of the problem; add illustrative material.*

Here the leader prepares a brief three or four minute introduction showing the basis of the discussion, relating it to previous discussions, and indicating some of the main sub-issues and the limits of the discussion. This is presented to the group. In preparing his outline he should consider different definitions and statements of the problem so that he will be ready to meet these when they arise in the discussion. For instance, for the illustration given, he will want to have at hand several definitions of "good," "propaganda," and "education." In the actual discussion, however, he should have the group prepare its own definitions or see clearly where their conflicting definitions differ. He should also have at hand illustrations to make the issue more personal and meaningful. These are often in the form of questions, as "Is all propaganda good? Is propaganda for our club good? Is it good for everyone?" etc.

3. *Explore large social or national phases of the problem.*

While personal illustrations are necessary to incite interest, the leader should have thought through wider implications of the problem in order to keep the group from being bogged down by too personal considerations of the issue. One of the greatest values of discussion is to widen the observations and to broaden the thinking of the group. For instance, "Does the education in our community differ from that in another community in our state? Nation? If what we have discussed and defined as 'good propaganda' here is education in our schools, is it 'good propaganda' and is it 'education' in other schools?"

4. *Analyze differences of opinions.*

In preparing the outline, the leader should think through as many of the different opinions as possible. These, as such, should not be presented to the group, but they should be drawn from the members of the group by questions and discussion. The thinking of the group should be directed toward analyzing and clarifying these differences. Above all else, well led discussions should teach us to see more clearly where, how, and why our opinions differ. For instance, some members of the group may feel that no propaganda is "good"; others may believe that some propaganda can be "good," but that even "good" propaganda and education are different; while others may believe that "good" propaganda and education are the same. In his preliminary study the leader should determine as well as possible just where these differences will come and their bases. The differences frequently arise because we do not define or use words the same way. Members of the group should be asked to redefine their positions clearly, to see that they are talking about the same things.

At this point in the discussion the leader should summarize these differences. His task will be much easier if in his outline he has given careful attention to different opinions. But in the discussion summary he must summarize the opinions as expressed by the group, although if he believes that other important view points have been omitted, he may well include these in his summary.

Here the discussion may be terminated. Its purpose has been to clarify conflicting opinions about the issue.

If the group wishes to pursue the discussion further, the discussion leader should follow his summary with a brief statement of some of the facts involved in the particular problem, sources for locating these, and ways in which these may be used. This is the "development of the discus-

sion," and its treatment is indicated in steps 5 to 9.

5. *Accumulate facts.*

One way out of an *impasse* is to ask for facts. Some members may have been making too sweeping statements on mere hear-say. In preparing his outline, the leader should secure some facts for the problem. For the illustration given above he will want to have at hand opinions of recognized students of propaganda and education, some knowledge of what is taught in our schools and how it is taught, some figures about the number of people who receive formal education and thus about their exposure to what some people call "good" propaganda. The group should be urged to accumulate similar facts.

6. *Verify the facts.*

For the leader this is one of the most difficult parts of the discussion. It will be easier if he is familiar with sources of information and "authorities." These should be indicated in his outline so that he can help the members of the group interpret their facts by asking such questions as, "Who collected the facts? For what purpose? When? Where? How? Are we justified in using them to support our opinions?"

7. *Analyze consequences.*

In his outline the leader will want to consider some of the consequences of the different points of view. When he leads the discussion, he will be better prepared to help the members of the group dig below the surface opposition of views, as expressed, to see if there is more potential agreement underneath. For instance, most of the members may love America's tradition of freedom. They may want their children's minds to develop freely and they may want them to do their own thinking. The leader might guide the discussion away from the "back and forth" of argument and counter argument to an analysis of the consequences of this and then of that solution or opinion. If "good" propaganda is education, what effect has this on our educational system? On our teaching? etc. The same questions can be asked about other opinions.

8. *Trace differences to differing assumptions.*

After facts have been presented and consequences explored, we are ready for a discussion of our differing assumptions or philosophies. These should have been considered by the leader in his outline. This is another way of helping members see why they disagree. What assumptions do we hold about the goodness and badness of propaganda? About the people who are affected by it? About its use by teachers? About informal education? etc. Never try to get agreement on all points. Narrow the disagreements, state them sharply and clearly, show how one set of assumptions (about the educability of the mass of the people, for instance) affect our opinions and points of view.

9. *Review the situation on the basis of general agreement.*

Opinions have been stated, definitions given, implications of the problem explored, differences analyzed, facts presented, consequences analyzed, and assumptions as bases of opinions related to differences. Now the leader is ready to summarize the discussion, to indicate the chief places where the group agreed and where it "agreed to disagree."

Here the discussion may be terminated, or it may be desirable to continue the discussion for the purpose of majority agreement upon one solution and the determination of methods for putting that solution into practice. In many discussions this is neither necessary nor desirable. In other cases, however, there should be a willingness, even a demand, to carry over into our behavior the conclusion of a discussion. This is when what is spoken of more narrowly as "action" is demanded. Steps 10 to 12 suggest procedure for discussion leading to action.

10. *Choose from the solutions proposed.*

From the various proposals presented the group should democratically choose the one it wishes to follow.

11. *Word the solution.*

This may be done by the group as a whole or, and usually this is easier, by a committee and referred back to the group.

12. *Find ways and means of putting solution into practice.*

This calls for realistic discussion of action.

USE OF THE DISCUSSION NOTES

The suggestions in this introduction and the "Suggested Activities and Discussion" following each monthly issue of PROPAGANDA ANALYSIS are offered as a bridge between the material contained in the letters and the discussion group.

The problems of one issue may well be discussed at several meetings. If the problem is too large for one meeting, the leader may divide it into its component parts, and discuss one part at each meeting.

1. *The problem for discussion.*

Study carefully the problem as you face it in your own locality, following suggestions made in the discussion notes. It may be wise with a new group to start discussion with a controversial problem which has not already become too emotionalized in the community. Use a problem whose discussion will reveal the use of propaganda, but not at first one which represents a very bitter conflict.

2. *Preparing the group for discussion.*

Discussion is a rather loose word used to cover the verbal exchange in all kinds of meetings. In many cases the members of the group do not coöperate. They differ but are not effective in clarifying their differences. They never quite define the real problem.

Effective discussion is a new art which must be learned slowly and carefully. Only through discussion and the wholesome sharing of opinions do we learn the great educative value of discussion.

People unused to discussion tend, when opposed in their views, to take a rigid either-or attitude. The members of the group should consciously avoid this and should adopt the attitude which says, "We may both be right; but perhaps neither your view nor mine is quite broad, fundamental, and inclusive enough. Let us seek other views."

It may be helpful to remind the group at the beginning of every meeting that, however important the values at stake in the problem to be discussed, truth is being sought, accuracy is essential to thinking, and impersonal criticism should be sought and listened to receptively.

If this is done patiently members will more and more frequently stop short in their most heated arguments and remember that doubt has its place, that criticism is good for mental growth.

DISCUSSION AND PROPAGANDA

If we are to understand propaganda, we must catch ourselves using it. There is need for and value in critical study and analysis of advertisements, newspapers, and other channels of communication. The danger in such studies is that we begin to feel smug and mentally superior to the other people who don't recognize propaganda. To offset this danger we need more self-criticism. We need a definite planning of situations which call forth our own use of propaganda. These occur when we find ourselves opposed by other members of the group, who feel as strongly as we do, but on opposite sides of the question. We suddenly find ourselves using all the tricks of the propagandists—we call the theories which we don't like "communist" or "reactionary," "pacifist" or "military," without real reference to the meanings of these terms. We label the things we like with glittering generalities—"democratic," "private enterprise," "for the good of all," again without defining just what we mean.

Two methods may be utilized to make special use of discussions for study of propaganda:

1. Two or three members might act as observers of the discussion. At the end of the meeting they might report the propaganda devices used.

2. At the most heated part of the discussion, the leader can suddenly break in, call for a minute or two of silent reflection. The emotionalism and exaggeration of the proponents will be brought into almost comical relief. It will then be highly revealing to turn the group's attention to the situations which have caused some members to feel strongly on one side of the question and others on other sides. This will help explain much about the sources and nature of propaganda.

The fact to underline is that as long as members of the group search for an understanding of propaganda and motives used by others, they may learn much of value; but they will not see the real subtlety of propaganda and propagandists until they turn the spotlight of critical thinking on themselves, their theories, and their behavior.

Minimum Reference Shelf

THE annotated bibliography which follows suggests a minimum number of the best books on propaganda, discussion methods, and education for democracy.[1] It is planned to assist the group leader and the group member in their study and discussion of propaganda and of public opinion. It includes essential books on background and method to help the leader appreciate the significance and far-reaching consequences of his work. The *why* is as important as the *how*.

The most intelligent way to become an effective group leader or group member is to combine experience with reading. This means choosing from the following skeleton lists those books, those chapters or pages, which correspond with the experience one is having as a member or a leader of a group. Because there are many kinds of groups, various types of discussion, and a large number of different difficulties which confront group study, it is important that the leader or member choose the book or bulletin which definitely speaks to his own difficulties and approach to group work.

A. TOWARDS AN UNDERSTANDING OF PROPAGANDA

Sumner, William G., *Folkways,* Ginn & Co., Boston, 1906. Detailed analyses of the customs, mores, and folkways of society. Chapters I and V are especially recommended for the student of public opinion.

Institute for Propaganda Analysis, Inc., 130 Morningside Drive, New York City. *The Group Leader's Guide to Propaganda Analysis,* 1938. Experimental study materials for use in high schools, in colleges, and in adult study groups; by Violet Edwards.

Robinson, J. H., *The Mind in the Making,* Harper & Bros., New York and London, 1921. A brief, simple and clear presentation of the relation of intelligence to social reform.

White, Andrew Dickson, *History of the Warfare Between Science and Theology in Christendom,* Appleton, New York, 1910. A classic interpretation of a major conflict which for centuries gave rise to propaganda in all of its manifestations. Two volumes.

Doob, Leonard W., *Propaganda—Its Psychology and Technique,* Henry Holt, New York, 1935. Consideration of propaganda as a *means* of social control, as a *method* by which individuals or groups work for their own interests; and the *effect* of propaganda upon individuals and upon society as a whole.

Lippman, Walter, *Public Opinion,* Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1922. Showing the dependence of opinion on prejudice and the factors which color judgment. See discussion of the stereotype.

Lumley, Frederick R., *The Propaganda Menace,* D. Appleton-Century, New York, 1933. A sociologist looks at propaganda and at the "definers" of propaganda, who disagree as to what is propaganda.

Odegard, Peter H., *The American Public Mind,* Columbia University Press, New York, 1930. An easy-to-read analysis of public opinion. The eleven brief chapters take the "mysticism" out of the phrase, "public opinion."

National Council for the Social Studies. Seventh Yearbook: *Education Against Propaganda* (Elmer Ellis, editor), published by the council at Harvard University, 1937. The implications of propaganda for education and particularly for the social studies in American schools today.

Graves, W. Brooks, *Readings in Public Opinion; Its Formation and Control,* D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1928. Rich study and discussion material concerning the formation and control of public opinion.

Riegel, O. W., *Mobilizing for Chaos: The Story of the New Propaganda,* Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1934. A study of the "propaganda of nationalism," particularly in the authoritarian nations.

B. FOR A CAREFUL STUDY OF DISCUSSION METHOD[2]

Sheffield, A. D., *Creative Discussion,* Associated Press, New York, 1927:1931. Brief statement of what it's all about. This little book will answer the first questions of discussion groups.

Elliott, H. S., *The Process of Group Thinking,* Associated Press, New York, 1928. Complete and detailed study of the technique of discussion, full of sensible suggestions of what to do and what not to do. Especially valuable for group leaders.

[1] Many other references, which should be helpful, are suggested in the text of the sixteen letters which make up this publication.

[2] See Appendix of *The Group Leader's Guide to Propaganda Analysis,* 1938 revision of the study materials of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis, for inexpensive bulletins concerning discussion methods.

Walser, Frank, *The Art of Conference,* Harper & Bros., New York, 1933. Analysis under twelve heads of the technical difficulties of discussion and of the use of pauses, and of the ways to deal with disagreement. Followed by 100 pages of case studies of successful and unsuccessful conferences in all fields.

Fansler, Thomas, *Discussion Method for Adult Groups,* American Association for Adult Education, New York, 1934. A study of discussions that were recorded word for word. The critical comments of the author on what was said contains many useful lessons in method.

Studebaker, John L., *The American Way,* McGraw-Hill, New York, 1935. Describes fruitful discussion and the principles of democracy at work in the Des Moines (Iowa) forums.

Bowman, LeRoy C., *How to Lead a Discussion,* The Woman's Press, New York, 1934. Short guide for the use of group leaders. Valuable for beginning groups.

Busch, Henry M., *Leadership in Group Work,* Associated Press, 1934. While this book touches only incidentally on discussion, it is of interest because it examines many of the basic issues underlying all group activity and leadership.

Ewing, R. L., *Methods of Conducting Forums and Discussions,* Association Press, New York, 1926. Useful for leaders. Detailed outlines are given of programs and procedures.

C. ON DEMOCRACY, ADULT EDUCATION, AND DISCUSSION

Cartwright, Morse A., *Ten Years of Adult Education,* MacMillan Company, New York, 1935. Abounding in useful facts and history of adult education.

Landis, Benson Y., *Rural Adult Education,* MacMillan Company, New York, 1933.

Lindeman, E. C., *Social Education,* The Republic Publishing Company, New York, 1933. An interpretation of the principles and methods of adult education by means of discussion.

Lindeman, E. C., *The Meaning of Adult Education,* The Republic Publishing Company, New York, 1926.

Dewey, John, *How We Think,* D. C. Heath and Company, New York, 1933. According to Dewey the significance of an idea must be judged by its practical consequences.

Clarke, E. L., *The Art of Straight Thinking,* Appleton, New York, 1929. An excellent review of the difficulties which must be overcome in thinking habits if discussion is to be successful.

Kilpatrick, William H., *Education and the Social Crisis,* Liveright, New York, 1932. The place of discussion in the adult education movement, and whether education shall lead or follow in the process of social change. By one of the leading disciples of Dewey.

Pigors, Paul, *Leadership or Domination,* Houghton Mifflin, New York, 1935.

Overstreet, Harry A., *About Ourselves,* Norton. New York, 1927.

Thouless, Robert H., *Straight and Crooked Thinking,* Simon & Schuster, New York, 1932. Some pitfalls in argument and straight thinking, with many illustrations of crooked thinking and methods of discussion.

Propaganda Analysis

A Bulletin to Help the Intelligent Citizen Detect and Analyze Propaganda

INSTITUTE FOR PROPAGANDA ANALYSIS, INC.
130 MORNINGSIDE DRIVE : NEW YORK CITY

Volume I OCTOBER, 1937 *Number 1*

Announcement

THE INSTITUTE FOR PROPAGANDA ANALYSIS is a non-profit corporation organized for scientific research in methods used by propagandists in influencing public opinion. It will conduct a continuous survey and analysis of propagandas. By objective and scientific scrutiny of the agencies, techniques, and devices utilized in the formation of public opinion, it will seek to show how to recognize propaganda and appraise it.

The Board of Directors and the Advisory Board include:

There is today especial need for propaganda analysis. America is beset by a confusion of conflicting propagandas, a Babel of voices, warnings, charges, counter-charges, assertions, and contradictions assailing us continually through press, radio, and newsreel. These propagandas are disseminated by political parties, labor unions, business organizations, farm organizations, patriotic societies, churches, schools, and other agencies; also by word of mouth by millions of individuals.

If American citizens are to have clear understanding of conditions and what to do about them, they must be able to recognize propaganda, to analyze, and to appraise it.

But what is propaganda?

As generally understood, *propaganda is expression of opinion or action by individuals or groups deliberately designed to influence opinions or actions of other individuals or groups with reference to predetermined ends.*

Thus propaganda differs from scientific analysis. The propagandist is trying to "put something across," good or bad, whereas the scientist is trying to discover truth and fact. Often the propagandist does not want careful scrutiny and criticism; he wants to bring about a specific action. Because the action may be socially beneficial or socially harmful to millions of people, it is necessary to focus upon the propagandist and his activities the searchlight of scientific scrutiny. Socially desirable propaganda will not suffer from such examination, but the opposite type will be detected and revealed for what it is.

Propaganda which concerns us most is that

which alters public opinion on matters of large social consequence often to the detriment of the majority of the people. Such propaganda, for example, is involved in issues such as these: Henry Ford and Tom Girdler should or should not recognize the C.I.O.; Hitler and Mussolini and many dignitaries of the Catholic Church are right or wrong in siding against the Spanish loyalists; Japan is right or wrong in attacking China; Congress is right or wrong in rejecting President Roosevelt's Supreme Court plan; the President is to blame or not to blame for not knowing that Supreme Court Justice Black once was or was not a member of the Ku Klux Klan; "exposure" of Justice Black represents or does not represent the interests of persons opposed to the New Deal program of social legislation.

Propaganda and Democracy

Many opinions or propagandas are highly charged with emotion, prejudice, bitterness. People make a virtue of defending their own opinions or propagandas. Many would deal with opinions or propagandas they don't like by suppressing them, by violence, if need be. But suppression of unpopular opinions or propagandas is contrary to democratic conceptions of government. A heresy or an unpopular propaganda or opinion may be bad, or good. One way to find out is by analysis and classification according to types and interests. This way the Institute for Propaganda Analysis will follow.

To deal with propaganda by suppression through federal legislation would violate the Constitution of the United States. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

These freedoms are the essence of democracy. In terms of them, the Institute will subject propagandas to scientific analysis and seek to indicate whether they conform or not to American principles of democracy.

When does a propaganda conform to democratic principles? It conforms when it tends to preserve and extend democracy; it is antagonistic when it undermines or destroys democracy.

Democracy has four parts, set forth or implied in the Constitution and federal statutes:

1. *Political*—Freedom to vote on public issues; freedom of press and speech to discuss those issues in public gatherings, in press, radio, motion pictures, etc.

2. *Economic*—Freedom to work and to participate in organizations and discussions to promote better working standards and higher living conditions for the people.

3. *Social*—Freedom from oppression based on theories of superiority or inferiority.

4. *Religious*—Freedom of worship, with separation of church and state.

With all of these freedoms are associated responsibilities. Thus, with freedom of the press goes the responsibility for accuracy in news and honesty in editorials.

Propagandas of those who pay lip service to the Constitution, if crystallized in action or law, would destroy one or more of these freedoms. Propagandas of others would preserve and extend these freedoms. These conflicting propagandas, moreover, divergent as to goals, often are similar in phrasing. Note for example the similarities in planks in opposing political party platforms, such as Socialist and Democratic, Communist and Republican; or note the similarity of labor and anti-labor propagandas. Sound analysis is necessary to enable citizens to distinguish these often-conflicting propagandas and to evaluate them in democratic terms.

Inseparable from propaganda analysis are periodic appraisals of controls over the channels through which opinions and propagandas flow: press, radio, motion pictures, labor unions, business and farm organizations, patriotic societies, churches, schools, and political parties.

What convictions, biases, and interests do these channels represent or express? Do these channels, by reason of bias, support and disseminate certain opinions or propagandas, and facts and alleged facts relating to them? Are other opinions or propagandas opposed by means of distortion, false emphasis, or censorship? The Institute for Propaganda Analysis will try to set up standards for appraising channels of propaganda as well as analyzing propaganda itself. It will give particular attention to "press agent" releases and "planned news" which flood American editorial offices.

Why are many misled by propaganda antagonistic to democracy? Few persons have had the opportunity to learn how to detect and analyze propaganda. Most books on propaganda are for

the benefit of the propagandist rather than for the public. Others are in technical terms understood only by persons familiar with the nomenclature of psychology and sociology. Furthermore, most of these treatises deal with propagandas of the past, not of today. It is *today's propagandas* flowing from today's conflicts which interest and concern us most. For example, analysis of World War propagandas of 1914–1918 is not as significant today as analysis of propagandas preparing perhaps for the next World War. Propagandas used by Eugene Debs and the employers in the Pullman Strike of 1894 are not as significant today as those being used in 1937 by John Lewis and Homer Martin, by Henry Ford and the Johnstown Citizens' Committee. The emphasis which high schools and colleges have given to dead issues of yesterday to the neglect of the living issues of today accounts for the fact that many high school and college graduates can be easily misled by anti-democratic propaganda.

What is the chief danger of propaganda? It appeals to emotion, and decisions made under stress of emotion often lead to disaster when the emotion crowds out cool, dispassionate thought.

Students and teachers especially should know how to deal with propaganda unemotionally.

Approximately sixteen million young people between the ages of fourteen and twenty in the next seven years will become voters. As such they will decide issues affecting every aspect of democratic freedom—political, economic, social, and religious. They cannot wait until they are twenty-one to learn how to decide issues unemotionally, critically, thoughtfully. They must be learning now how to avoid decisions antagonistic to democracy.

Do most Americans believe students should analyze propaganda? Yes. Dr. George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, in May 1936, polled the nation on the question: "Should schools teach the facts about all forms of government including Communism, Fascism and Socialism?" Dr. Gallup's findings were: "Sixty-two per cent of the voters say the schools should teach *the facts* about all forms of government including Communism, Fascism and Socialism. Thirty-eight per cent say the schools should not teach those facts." It follows logically that teaching *the facts* involves careful scrutiny of the conflicting propagandas allegedly based on "the facts."

Do teachers think analysis of propaganda should be taught? Yes. In August 1937, several professors at Teachers College, Columbia University and the School of Education of New York University collaborated on a survey of teacher opinion with regard to propaganda analysis by students in high schools and colleges. They put the question to 500 teachers representing all states in the union and all types of schools. Ninety-eight per cent advocated *a critical study in the schools of propaganda* which would help prepare young people to function as intelligent citizens in discussing and voting on controversial issues; they said that in treating such issues in the school, *teaching pupils how to think* is more important than teaching them what to think.

Will schools participate in propaganda analysis? Yes. Study units on how to detect and analyze propaganda will be used this year in Horace Mann and Lincoln Schools of Teachers College, Columbia University; in the Public Schools of Bronxville and Gloversville, New York; in Rock Island, Illinois and Newton, Massachusetts; in the State Teachers College at Milwaukee; and in the University High School, Northwestern University. These study units will be made available to schools receiving *Propaganda Analysis.*

Is there recognition of the need to analyze facts, alleged facts, opinions, propaganda? Yes. It is implied in the public forum movement; in privately circulated letters for business men prepared by such as the Kiplinger Washington Agency, the Whaley-Eaton Service, Harland Allen; in the New York Herald-Tribune Annual Forum on Current Problems; in various college conferences on economics, politics, and world issues; in recent editorials of the *New York Times* (Sept. 1, 1937) and *Springfield Republican* (Sept. 3, 1937); in the reports and programs of the Foreign Policy Association, in the privately circulated reports of Consumers Union; in the programs and addresses of educators, clergymen, and editors at the Williamstown Institute of Human Relations arranged by the National Conference of Jews and Christians; and in various radio programs including the University of Chicago Round Table and the Town Meeting of the Air. H. G. Wells included the study of propaganda in his blue print of a new system of education before the 1937 meeting of the British Association for the Advance-

ment of Science, (*New York Times,* Sept. 5, 1937). All persons, according to his blue print, should study propaganda and advertising methods as a corrective to newspaper reading.

"Free propaganda," wrote the *Springfield Republican,* Sept. 3, 1937, "is nothing but free publicity for the views, interpretations, arguments, pleadings, truths and untruths, half-lies and lies of all creation. Propaganda is good as well as bad. 'We are surrounded by clouds of propaganda.' . . . It is up to each of us to precipitate from those clouds the true and the false, the near-true and the near-false, identifying and giving to each classification its correct label."

In line with the foregoing opinions the Institute, by methods of education and scientific research, will help the intelligent citizen detect and analyze propaganda so that he may form his own judgment as to what is good and bad.

The Institute's second letter, to be issued November 1, will set forth the devices most commonly used by propagandists and will illustrate these with examples of propagandas taken from current newspapers and magazines. Knowledge of these devices enables the intelligent citizen to detect much propaganda easily, some of its instantaneously. By applying simple checks much of it can be classified as conforming to or antagonistic to democratic principles.

How will the Institute be financed? Money to begin its work has been given by the Good Will Fund, Inc., a charitable corporation financed by the late Edward A. Filene. It is hoped that eventually the Institute will be self-supporting. Income from the sale of its letters and donations from organizations and individuals will be used to increase the scope of its research and to permit it to issue special letters or bulletins when occasions warrant—occasions such as tense political conflicts, great strikes, threats of war.

The Institute invites intelligent citizens to subscribe to its monthly letter. The cost is $2.00 a year. A subscription card is inclosed. Many may desire to make *Propaganda Analysis* available to local high school and college students by having the monthly letter sent to teachers of social science, English, and journalism.

A Final Word

The Institute does not have all the answers; it lays no claim to infallibility. It will try to be scientific, objective, and accurate. If it makes mistakes, it will acknowledge them. It asks those who receive its letters to check its work; also to cooperate with it by supplying documented evidence on the sources of propaganda, and of censorship or distortion of essential news in press, radio, and newsreels. *Chiefly the Institute will try to acquaint its subscribers with methods whereby they may become proficient in making their own analyses.*

The charter of the Institute, under which it is organized as a non-profit corporation, contains the following statement of its purposes: "To assist the public in detecting and analyzing propaganda by conducting scientific research and education in the methods by which public opinion is influenced, by the analysis of propaganda methods and devices, and by the distribution of reports thereon.

"It shall *not* be within the purposes or powers of the corporation to engage in propaganda or otherwise attempt to influence legislation and the corporation shall *not,* either as one of its purposes or as a means of furthering any of its purposes, engage in propaganda or otherwise attempt to influence legislation."

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES AND DISCUSSION NOTES

1. Ask various people how they would define "propaganda." Try to secure as many definitions as possible. Don't consult a dictionary, simply get personal opinions and theories. Have the group discuss these definitions and build its own definition. Do you accept the definition printed in the first issue of *Propaganda Analysis?*

2. Why is propaganda effective?

3. Is there any "good" propaganda or is all propaganda "bad"?

4. Should the Government stop "bad" propaganda?

5. Who should decide which propaganda should be stopped? What would a dictator do in this respect? What should a democracy do?

6. Some people see in the free flow of propagandas the danger of confusion and division in a democracy. Do you think these negative effects are present? If so, can they be prevented? How?

7. What are we doing in our own communities to counteract some of the negative effects of propaganda? Could we do more? Should we do more?

8. What are the best ways to help people think critically? Does our modern education use these methods?

9. What makes people think the way they do?

Volume I NOVEMBER, 1937 *Number 2*

How to Detect Propaganda

WE ARE fooled by propaganda chiefly because we don't recognize it when we see it. It may be fun to be fooled but, as the cigarette ads used to say, it is more fun to know. We can more easily recognize propaganda when we see it if we are familiar with the seven common propaganda devices. These are:

1. The Name Calling Device
2. The Glittering Generalities Device
3. The Transfer Device
4. The Testimonial Device
5. The Plain Folks Device
6. The Card Stacking Device
7. The Band Wagon Device

Why are we fooled by these devices? Because they appeal to our emotions rather than to our reason. They make us believe and do something we would not believe or do if we thought about it calmly, dispassionately. In examining these devices, note that they work most effectively at those times when we are too lazy to think for ourselves; also, they tie into emotions which sway us to be "for" or "against" nations, races, religions, ideals, economic and political policies and practices, and so on through automobiles, cigarettes, radios, toothpastes, presidents, and wars. With our emotions stirred, it may be fun to be fooled by these propaganda devices, but it is more fun and infinitely more to our own interests to know how they work.

Lincoln must have had in mind citizens who could balance their emotions with intelligence when he made his remark: ". . . but you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

Name Calling

"Name Calling" is a device to make us form a judgment without examining the evidence on which it should be based. Here the propagandist appeals to our hate and fear. He does this by giving "bad names" to those individuals, groups, nations, races, policies, practices, beliefs, and ideals which he would have us condemn and reject. For centuries the name "heretic" was bad. Thousands were oppressed, tortured, or put to death as heretics. Anybody who dissented from popular or group belief or practice was in danger of being called a heretic. In the light of today's knowledge, some heresies were bad and some were good. Many of the pioneers of modern science were called heretics; witness the cases of Copernicus, Galileo, Bruno. (See "A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology," Andrew Dickson White, D. Appleton & Co.) Today's bad names include: Fascist, demagogue, dictator, Red, financial oligarchy, Communist, muck-raker, alien, outside agitator, economic royalist, Utopian, rabble-rouser, trouble-maker, Tory, Constitution wrecker.

"Al" Smith called Roosevelt a Communist by implication when he said in his Liberty League speech, "There can be only one capital, Washington or Moscow." When "Al" Smith was running for the presidency many called him a tool of the Pope, saying in effect, "We must choose between Washington and Rome." That implied that Mr. Smith, if elected President, would take his orders from the Pope. Recently, Mr. Justice Hugo Black has been associated with a bad name, Ku Klux Klan. In these cases some propagandists have tried to make us form judgments without examining essential evidence and implications. "Al Smith is a Catholic. He must never be President." "Roosevelt is a Red. Defeat his program." "Hugo Black is or was a Klansman. Take him out of the Supreme Court."

Use of "bad names" without presentation of their essential meaning, without all their pertinent implications, comprises perhaps the most common of all propaganda devices. Those who want to *maintain* the status quo apply bad names to those who would change it. For example, the Hearst press applies bad names to Communists and Socialists. Those who want to *change* the status quo apply bad names to those who would maintain it. For example, the Daily Worker and the American Guardian apply bad names to conservative Republicans and Democrats.

Glittering Generalities

"Glittering Generalities" is a device by which the propagandist identifies his program with

virtue by use of "virtue words." Here he appeals to our emotions of love, generosity, and brotherhood. He uses words like truth, freedom, honor, liberty, social justice, public service, the right to work, loyalty, progress, democracy, the American way, Constitution defender. These words suggest shining ideals. All persons of good will believe in these ideals. Hence the propagandist, by identifying his individual group, nation, race, policy, practice, or belief with such ideals, seeks to win us to his cause. As Name Calling is a device to make us form a judgment to *reject and condemn,* without examining the evidence, Glittering Generalities is a device to make us *accept and approve,* without examining the evidence.

For example, use of the phrases, "the right to work" and "social justice" may be a device to make us accept programs for meeting the labor-capital problem which, if we examined them critically, we would not accept at all.

In the Name Calling and Glittering Generalities devices, words are used to stir up our emotions and to befog our thinking. In one device "bad words" are used to make us mad; in the other "good words" are used to make us glad. (See "The Tyranny of Words," by Stuart Chase, in *Harpers Magazine* for November, 1937.)

The propagandist is most effective in use of these devices when his words make us create devils to fight or gods to adore. By his use of the "bad words," we personify as a "devil" some nation, race, group, individual, policy, practice, or ideal; we are made fighting mad to destroy it. By use of "good words," we personify as a god-like idol some nation, race, group, etc. Words which are "bad" to some are "good" to others, or may be made so. Thus, to some the New Deal is "a prophecy of social salvation" while to others it is "an omen of social disaster."

From consideration of names, "bad" and "good," we pass to institutions and symbols, also "bad" and "good." We see these in the next device.

Transfer

"Transfer" is a device by which the propagandist carries over the authority, sanction, and prestige of something we respect and revere to something he would have us accept. For example, most of us respect and revere our church and our nation. If the propagandist succeeds in getting church or nation to approve a campaign in behalf of some program, he thereby transfers its authority, sanction, and prestige to that program. Thus we may accept something which otherwise we might reject.

In the Transfer device symbols are constantly used. The cross represents the Christian Church. The flag represents the nation. Cartoons like Uncle Sam represent a consensus of public opinion. Those symbols stir emotions. At their very sight, with the speed of light, is aroused the whole complex of feelings we have with respect to church or nation. A cartoonist by having Uncle Sam disapprove a budget for unemployment relief would have us feel that the whole United States disapproves relief costs. By drawing an Uncle Sam who approves the same budget, the cartoonist would have us feel that the American people approve it. Thus, the Transfer device is used both for and against causes and ideas.

Testimonial

The "Testimonial" is a device to make us accept anything from a patent medicine or a cigarette to a program of national policy. In this device the propagandist makes use of testimonials. "When I feel tired, I smoke a Camel and get the grandest 'lift.' " "We believe the John Lewis plan of labor organization is splendid; C. I. O. should be supported." This device works in reverse also; counter-testimonials may be employed. Seldom are these used against commercial products like patent medicines and cigarettes, but they are constantly employed in social, economic, and political issues. "We believe that the John Lewis plan of labor organization is bad; C. I. O. should not be supported."

Plain Folks

"Plain Folks" is a device used by politicians, labor leaders, business men, and even by ministers and educators to win our confidence by appearing to be people like ourselves—"just plain folks among the neighbors." In election years especially do candidates show their devotion to little children and the common, homey things of life. They have front porch campaigns. For the newspaper men they raid the kitchen cupboard, finding there some of the good wife's apple pie. They go to country picnics; they attend service at the old frame church; they pitch hay and go fishing; they show their belief in home and mother. In short, they would win our

votes by showing that they're just as common as the rest of us—"just plain folks,"—and, therefore, wise and good. Business men often are "plain folks" with the factory hands. Even distillers use the device. "It's our family's whiskey, neighbor; and neighbor, it's your price."

Card Stacking

"Card Stacking" is a device in which the propagandist employs all the arts of deception to win our support for himself, his group, nation, race, policy, practice, belief or ideal. He stacks the cards against the truth. He uses underemphasis and over-emphasis to dodge issues and evade facts. He resorts to lies, censorship, and distortion. He omits facts. He offers false testimony. He creates a smoke-screen of clamor by raising a new issue when he wants an embarrassing matter forgotten. He draws a red herring across the trail to confuse and divert those in quest of facts he does not want revealed. He makes the unreal appear real and the real appear unreal. He lets half-truth masquerade as truth. By the Card Stacking device, a mediocre candidate, through the "build-up," is made to appear an intellectual titan; an ordinary prize fighter a probable world champion; a worthless patent medicine a beneficent cure. By means of this device propagandists would convince us that a ruthless war of aggression is a crusade for righteousness. Some member nations of the Non-Intervention Committee send their troops to intervene in Spain. Card Stacking employs sham, hypocrisy, effrontery.

The Band Wagon

The "Band Wagon" is a device to make us follow the crowd, to accept the propagandist's program en masse. Here his theme is: "Everybody's doing it." His techniques range from those of medicine show to dramatic spectacle. He hires a hall, fills a great stadium, marches a million men in parade. He employs symbols, colors, music, movement, all the dramatic arts. He appeals to the desire, common to most of us, to "follow the crowd." Because he wants us to "follow the crowd" in masses, he directs his appeal to groups held together by common ties of nationality, religion, race, environment, sex, vocation. Thus propagandists campaigning for or against a program will appeal to us as Catholics, Protestants, or Jews; as members of the Nordic race or as Negroes; as farmers or as school teachers; as housewives or as miners. All the artifices of flattery are used to harness the fears and hatreds, prejudices, and biases, convictions and ideals common to the group; thus emotion is made to push and pull the group on to the Band Wagon. In newspaper articles and in the spoken word this device is also found. "Don't throw your vote away. Vote for our candidate. He's sure to win." Nearly every candidate wins in every election—before the votes are in.

Propaganda and Emotion

Observe that in all these devices our emotion is the stuff with which propagandists work. Without it they are helpless; with it, harnessing it to their purposes, they can make us glow with pride or burn with hatred, they can make us zealots in behalf of the program they espouse. As we said in our first letter, propaganda as generally understood is expression of opinion or action by individuals or groups with reference to predetermined ends. Without the appeal to our emotion—to our fears and to our courage, to our selfishness and unselfishness, to our loves and to our hates—propagandists would influence few opinions and few actions.

To say this is not to condemn emotion, an essential part of life, or to assert that all predetermined ends of propagandists are "bad." What we mean is that the intelligent citizen does not want propagandists to utilize his emotions, even to the attainment of "good" ends, without knowing what is going on. He does not want to be "used" in the attainment of ends he may later consider "bad." He does not want to be gullible. He does not want to be fooled. He does not want to be duped, even in a "good" cause. He wants to know the facts and among these is included the fact of the utilization of his emotions.

For better understanding of the relationship between propaganda and emotion see Ch. 1 of *Folkways* by William Graham Sumner (Ginn and Company). This shows why most of us tend to feel, believe, and act in traditional patterns. See also *Mind in the Making* by James Harvey Robinson (Harper Bros.). This reveals the nature of the mind and suggests how to analyze propaganda appealing to traditional thought patterns.

Keeping in mind the seven common propaganda devices, turn to today's newspapers and almost immediately you can spot examples of

them all. At election time or during any campaign, Plain Folks and Band Wagon are common. Card Stacking is hardest to detect because it is adroitly executed or because we lack the information necessary to nail the lie. A little practice with the daily newspapers in detecting these propaganda devices soon enables us to detect them elsewhere—in radio, news-reel, books, magazines, and in expression of labor unions, business groups, churches, schools, political parties.

Our December letter will suggest some propaganda tests and antidotes.

Comment

Much comment followed announcement in October of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis—some favorable, some unfavorable. Largest responses came from business men, lawyers, educators, students, ministers. Many emphasized the staggering task we had undertaken, questioned our ability to perform it. Our reply: the task *is* staggering, too difficult for any one group no matter how hard it tries to be fair, scientific, objective. We cannot hope to do a one hundred per cent job. The Institute does not have all the answers; it lays no claim to infallibility. We don't propose to tell our subscribers *what to think;* we aim to help them and to help ourselves learn *how to think.* In this effort we put our faith in the method of analysis. Using analysis we and our subscribers will make fewer mistakes, will be fooled less frequently, will learn better how to see our way through the confusion of propagandas and counter-propagandas. Over and above, we should have a good time, because *it is "more fun to know."*

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES AND DISCUSSION NOTES

1. Cut out a number of advertisements and political speeches; paste them in a work-book; and note in the margin the propaganda devices used.

2. Using propaganda devices, make a number of speeches before the group. Ask the other members of the group to make notes of the propaganda devices used and to discuss them later.

3. Deliver the same speech, first in a monotone, then with all the available skill and power of innuendo and feeling. Discuss the different effects on the listener.

4. Attend a public political speech, and afterwards ask the speaker the meaning of some of his words which may have been used, consciously or unconsciously, as propaganda devices.

5. All the members of the group might attend a political meeting or listen to the same radio address; then compare the interpretation each member has of the speech. Consider what factors cause the differences in interpretation.

6. Get into a discussion over some emotionalized, controversial subject. Ask a friend to help you catch yourself using one or more of the seven propaganda devices.

7. Discuss the propaganda aspects of advertising. Is there a difference between propaganda advertising and informative advertising?

8. What are some of the best ways of learning how to buy more intelligently? Are these methods taught in schools and colleges? Could they be improved?

9. How can a study of propaganda help us buy more intelligently?

10. Why do large businesses like a telephone company or a milk concern, which have a monopoly or a concession, continue to advertise?

11. Is it possible to use any of the seven propaganda devices in a "right" way? For "good" and "useful" purposes?

Volume I DECEMBER, 1937 *Number 3*

Some ABC's of Propaganda Analysis

ON NOVEMBER 10TH the *New York Herald Tribune* printed letters from various readers expressing opinions about the proposed visit of the Duke and Duchess of Windsor to America.

Intentionally or unintentionally the writers of these letters used two of the common propaganda devices listed in our November letter: Name Calling and Glittering Generalities.[1] Nor are these devices illustrated only in the arguments for and against the Windsors' proposed visit to America; they may also be observed in statements and counter-statements about other items in the recent news; for example, Italy's pact with Japan and Germany "to fight Communism" with an implied challenge to the traditional South American policy of the United States; the Brussels Conference to end Japan's war on China; Hitler's independent efforts to mediate in the same war; the special session of Congress with its arguments for and against proposed measures dealing with wages and hours, child labor, crop control, reorganization of the Federal Government, budget, relief, and foreign policy.

Not only will subscribers have found the various propaganda devices illustrated in discussion arising from these events, but they will have recognized that all the events mentioned have one thing in common, namely conflict. The point brings us to some A B C's of Propaganda Analysis:

First: All propaganda is associated with conflict in some form – either as cause, or as effect, or as both cause and effect.

Second: If we check our own opinions with respect to conflicts about which we feel strongly – on which we take sides – we see the direction of our own propagandas or opinions.

Third: Propaganda which concerns us most is *today's* propaganda associated with *today's* conflicts. It affects our incomes, our businesses, our working conditions, our health, our education, our rights and responsibilities in fields political, economic, social, and religious.

Fourth: Our own opinions, even with respect to today's propagandas, have been largely determined for us by inheritance and environment. We are born white or black, Jewish or Gentile, Catholic or Protestant, rich or poor. We have been reared in urban or rural communities, North or South, East or West. Our parents have been devout believers, ardent freethinkers, or indifferent to religious doctrine. Our beliefs and actions mirror the conditioning influences of home and neighborhood, church and school, vocation and political party. We resemble those whose inheritance and environment are similar to ours; we are bound to them by ties of common experience. We tend to respond favorably to their opinions and propagandas because they are "our kind of people." We tend to distrust the opinions of those who differ from us in inheritance and environment. Only drastic changes in our life conditions, with new and different experiences, associations, and influences can offset or cancel out the effect of inheritance and long years of environment.

Fifth: A fundamental step in propaganda analysis, therefore, is to analyze ourselves, to make clear *why* we act and believe as we do with respect to various conflicts and issues – political, economic, social, and religious. Do we believe and act as we do because we are Jews, Protestants, Catholics; because our fathers were strong Republicans or lifelong Democrats; because our parents were Methodists or Seventh Day Adventists; because our fathers belonged to labor unions; because our fathers were employers who fought labor unions?

Sixth: The most effective way to deal with propaganda, once we recognize it, is *to suspend our judgment until we obtain essential facts and implications involved in the propaganda.* We must ask: Who is the propagandist? Is he consciously and intentionally trying to influence our thoughts and actions? For what purpose does he use the common propaganda devices? How does he use words and symbols?

[1] These devices, it will be remembered, are: Name Calling, Glittering Generalities, Transfer, Testimonial, Plain Folks, Card Stacking, and Band Wagon.

What are their exact meanings? What do they mean to the propagandist? What do they mean to us? What are the propagandist's interests? Do his interests coincide with the interests of most citizens?

Seventh: The fact that some words are *omnibus words* makes many the easy dupes of propagandists. Omnibus words are words extraordinarily difficult to define. They carry all meanings to all men. Therefore, the best test for the factual content of propaganda lies in specific, concrete definition of the words and symbols used by the propagandist. Moreover, sharp definition is the best antidote against words and symbols carrying a high charge of emotion. Such a test is discussed in "As I View the Thing," a column by Sam Tucker in the *Decatur Herald,* Decatur, Illinois, October 29, 1937, from which the following extracts are quoted:[2]

"ORATORY IS THE ART of making pleasant sounds, which cause the hearers to say 'Yes, Yes' in sympathy with the performer, without inquiring too closely exactly what he means. Nearly all so-called political debate is oratory, by this unflattering definition. So also, I am compelled to admit, are nearly all newspaper editorials, most of the lectures on economics, and most sermons.

"Let us, just as a laboratory experiment, and not for any practical purpose — far less, for any purpose of discrediting the speakers — examine two typical paragraphs, from two recent political speeches. . . .

SPECIMEN NO. 1

"Liberty and freedom should mean a fair distribution of the rewards of production and should prevent an unhealthy concentration of wealth and economic power in individual hands or government.

SPECIMEN NO. 2

"True liberalism does not start as an economic system. An economic system flows from it. The only economic system which will not destroy intellectual and spiritual freedom is private enterprise, regulated to prevent special privilege or coercion.

"The first word is 'liberty.' Tell me, please, exactly what liberty is. Where does it begin, and where does it leave off? And while you are working at this problem, notice please the second noun in the sentence: 'freedom.' Presumably it means something different from 'liberty,' because our great political leader would not have considered it necessary to couple the two if they meant the same thing. . . .

"After you have worked out these definitions, I invite you to look back again at the two quotations from the Great Minds. There are a lot of further questions I have for you. What is a 'fair distribution'? Does it mean the same thing to you as to your housemaid, your hired man, or the machine operator in your factory? What are the 'rewards of production'? Again, I want you to be definite, not furry. How much concentration of wealth is an 'unhealthy' concentration? What is 'government'? If you think that last is easy, I will undertake to give you a bad half-hour in conversation.

"In the Specimen No. 2, following the same stern effort to get at some real kernel of meaning, under rank flowering jungle of verbiage, I want to know your definition of 'liberalism,' and of 'economic system.' I invite you to set down in specific terms on paper, in firm, solid terms a plain man can understand, what distinction you make between 'intellectual and spiritual freedom,' as the words are used by the speaker. Tell me what, exactly, is 'private enterprise.' Does a man who runs a tavern, selling liquor to minors, operate a 'private enterprise'?

"Perhaps you will be able to do better with all these problems than I can. Sincerely I hope so. For the fact is, that after earnest study of these sonorous examples of oratory, substituting the word 'blah' for every well-sounding word I cannot turn into a firm meaning, I get this translation of two famous speeches:

NO. 1

"Blah and Blah should mean a Blah-blah of the blah of blah, and should prevent an blahy blah of blah and blah power in individual hands or blah.

NO. 2

"True blah does not start as a blah blah. A blah blah flows from it. The only blah blah which will not destroy blah and blah blah is blah-blah, regulated to prevent blah-blah or blah.

"If either speech contains any more precise meaning than that, you'll have to prove it, and then you'll have to prove that the meaning you read into it carried into the intelligence of anybody else, beside yourself."

While Mr. Tucker gives his points humorous

[2] As this letter goes to press, the staff of the Institute does not know whose oratory Mr. Tucker is quoting.

emphasis characterized by what some readers would call hyperbole, his tests and antidotes none the less will be recognized by our subscribers as having particular application to the propaganda devices of Name Calling, Glittering Generalities, and Transfer.[8] The process applies, however, to all the seven common propaganda devices. Not only must we define the meanings of words, phrases, slogans, and symbols, but we must check the facts and alleged facts, as well as omission of facts and distortion of facts found in Card Stacking. Especially must we be critical of our own emotions and feelings when we recognize the Plain Folks and Band Wagon devices. It may be that the propagandist gives us all essential facts and implications; it may be that he makes his words specify clearly things which mean the same thing to persons of widely varying characteristics and environment. That is something for our analysis to determine. The analysis must include ourselves, the propagandist, and the words, symbols, facts, and alleged facts with which the propagandist deals. The process is not easy. It is made easier by readings suggested in our November letter: Chapter One of *Folkways* by William Graham Sumner, and *The Mind in the Making* by James Harvey Robinson.

Professors Sumner and Robinson show why we act and believe as we do, why we react to propaganda, why the common propaganda devices are effective unless checked by our critical thinking. They reveal basic principles of propaganda analysis. For example, out of a background of anthropology and history they show:

First: We are creatures of custom, habit, tradition, folkways. "Custom regulates the whole of man's actions." We cling to the example of our predecessors; hence the effectiveness of the propagandist's appeal to traditional ways of believing and acting.

Second: Groups having much in common by reason of inheritance and environment (Sumner's "we-groups") think their own ways of acting and believing the only "right ways." They praise their own folkways (Glittering Generalities, Transfer, Plain Folks, Band Wagon) and apply bad names and symbols to the ways of others (Name Calling, Transfer).

Disagreement with a we-group's accepted ways of acting and thinking is heresy, an evil to be condemned and punished. Most propagandas are associated with conflicts arising from dissent from accepted ways of acting and believing in spheres political, economic, social, and religious.

Third: Many accepted ways and beliefs take on a glamour of sentiment or pathos, a large emotional element which makes them appear impregnable to examination and criticism. Examples: mother-love, homeland, democracy, patriotism. Some propagandists take advantage of this as may be seen, for instance, in Mother's Day and the commercial uses to which it is put.

Fourth: Language is largely an emotional outlet, as we observe in Name Calling and Glittering Generalities, "corresponding to various cooings, growlings, snarls, crowings, and brayings." Test your newspaper columnists for bad names and for such "snarls, brayings, cooings," and Glittering Generalities. Are these used by Westbrook Pegler, Hugh S. Johnson, Dorothy Thompson, Walter Lippmann, Heywood Broun, Paul B. Mallon, Walter Winchell, and O. O. McIntyre?

Fifth: The best way to deal with propaganda whether it be expressed in action, symbols, or words is to criticize and analyze it. Analysis aids in explaining our responses to propaganda devices; it reveals the strategy of the propagandist. It is at once a test and an antidote. It operates immediately to make us suspend judgment until we can form a judgment on a broader basis of facts. Thus it is a test which materially aids in showing whether or not a particular propaganda conforms to or is antagonistic to the specific freedoms and responsibilities listed or suggested in our October letter. If we accept them as a standard for measurement, analysis is an antidote to protect us against propagandas antagonistic to them.

To sum up, the citizen who questions and challenges propaganda will deal with it by analysis. He knows that words and symbols often are intoxicants, to make us mad or glad, to put us in a towering rage or a rosy glow. He will subject omnibus words to sharp definition. He will ask: "What do these words and symbols mean? What do they mean to the propagandist? What would the propagandist have them

[8] See also: Stuart Chase, "The Tyranny of Words," *Harpers Magazine*, November, 1937; Kenneth Burke, "Reading While You Run," *The New Republic*, November, 1937; Arthur Schopenhauer, *Essay on the Art of Controversy;* Thurman W. Arnold, *The Symbols of Government* and *The Folklore of Capitalism.*

mean to me? Who is the propagandist? What are his purposes and his interests? Do his interests correspond with my interests? Do they correspond with the interests of most citizens?" The intelligent citizen will not do something because "everybody's doing it" (Band Wagon). He will be aware of the tendency on the part of participants in a crowd to let their enthusiasm run away with their judgment. Professor Sumner says that the educated man, "if he is wise, just when a crowd is filled with enthusiasms and emotion, will leave it . . . and form his own judgment."

Comment

Many readers have asked for a list of books on propaganda. We prefer to recommend only a book or two at a time. A basic book is *Propaganda* by Leonard W. Doob (Henry Holt and Co., New York, 417 pages, $3.60). Among other aspects of propaganda Professor Doob describes its relationship to conflict, emotion, suggestibility. He stresses the importance of analyzing *today's* propaganda, describes Communist and Nazi propaganda. Much of it is clear, easy reading; for the average reader, its technical classifications may be skipped without great loss.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES AND DISCUSSION NOTES

1. Let two members of the group deliver almost the same speech. One should use forceful generalizations, with emphasis on appeal to feelings. The other should emphasize accuracy and facts, with appeal to thought. Discuss comparative values of these two types of speeches.

2. Arrange for the group to attend a public meeting or to listen to the same radio address. Assign to some members of the group the responsibility of systematically noting all the "blah" words used (the vague, indefinite words appealing to feelings). Discuss these words in the group. Examine their meanings.

3. Make a "Blah" Dictionary based on the group's discussion of the meanings of the words studied in Question 2 and of other words submitted by the group. Such words as the following might be included: "communist," "red," "queer," "Americanism," "racket," "revolutionary," "fascist," "economic royalist," "tory," "conservative," "reactionary," "dealers in death," etc. Distribute copies of this Dictionary before attending the next big political speech. Does an understanding of these and similar words help you evaluate propaganda?

4. Listen to speeches representing different shades of opinion on political, social, and economic issues. After each speech write down the dogmas which the speaker assumed and which the audience appeared to accept. Discuss these dogmas critically.

5. Discuss the following questions: What are effective means of counteracting some of the harmful effects of modern propaganda? What factors determine an individual's receptivity to propaganda?

6. Examine your own interests and activities. Do organizations with which you are associated use propaganda in order to secure trade, votes, subscriptions, etc.? Are their statements misleading? Who is responsible for such statements? As a member of the group are you responsible?

7. How much does misleading propaganda destroy confidence? Confidence in what? In whom? What purpose does this sort of confidence serve? Are people in small communities more susceptible to propaganda than residents of large cities?

Volume I JANUARY, 1938 *Number 4*

How to Analyze Newspapers[1]

FROM time to time these letters will deal with channels of communication. This letter suggests some points for us to keep in mind in analyzing newspapers. For those who would understand how propaganda operates with reference to today's issues, the newspaper has special significance. Every day it brings us in printed form examples of propaganda which we can read, clip, and study at our convenience.

One should remember that propaganda is always associated with conflict—as cause, as effect, or as cause and effect. In this respect propaganda has something in common with news. So close is the association that it may properly be said that news is usually the story of some con-

[1] This is the first of two letters on analyzing newspapers.

flict. The age-long battle of men against the impersonal forces of nature—fire, flood, drought, heat, and cold—gives us recurringly many exciting conflicts which become news. The struggle of men to learn the secrets of natural forces and to harness them to the purposes of men is itself a conflict, waged through the centuries. Out of this conflict—mankind's battle for increased knowledge—have come the stories, the news of scientific achievements in many related fields.

Observed much more frequently in the news, however, are the conflicts of men with men and groups of men with other groups of men. A robber attacks an honest citizen. The police capture the robber. The prisoner is tried—conflict between prosecution and defense. Or a group of men, a labor union, disputes with an employer or a group of employers over wages and working conditions. These and other groups bring conflicting pressures on governmental bodies to make laws or to use police power to help accomplish some desired ends. If there are sharp differences of opinion about the ends sought or about methods used to attain these ends, there are additional conflicts which may illustrate many or all of the common propagandas we find associated with stresses and pressures involving government, business, and labor.

Two Main Purposes

Every American newspaper, unless its expenses are paid by some individual or group for the attainment of some special end, must have two main purposes. *First, it must show a profit.* In this it is like the corner drug store. *Second, in order to make money, it must print news which attracts and holds readers.* In most cases a newspaper's main source of income is advertising. Ordinarily, it can obtain advertising at profitable rates only when it has enough readers to make the advertising profitable to the enterprises which pay for it.

What kinds of news and conflicts attract readers? That depends on the readers. The more intelligent readers of wide interests are attracted and held by the kinds of basic conflicts featured in the news of such papers as *The New York Times, The New York Herald Tribune, The Baltimore Sun, The Christian Science Monitor, The Springfield Republican, The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, The St. Louis Star Times, The Des Moines Register, The Kansas City Star.* (America has some of the best newspapers in the world; the above named papers are widely rated among the best.) A number of the conflicts featured by these newspapers, like propagandas which concern us most, have some significant bearing on matters of large social consequence: our incomes, our working conditions, our health, our education, our civil freedoms, and our responsibilities.

Even the best available newspapers print much news not because it has any significant bearing on our everyday problems, but simply because it is entertaining. Under the head of entertainment come the comic strips, the society columns, and much of the news involving crime, vice, and sex. Most of this entertainment news has little bearing on matters of large social significance although some of it does unquestionably affect popular standards of behavior and thought, which are areas important to analysts of propaganda. A sensational murder or sex crime might be emphasized in a manner to divert attention deliberately from the basic sources of such crimes or from deeper, more general, social disorders.

Freedom of the Press

Especially important are the propagandas and news items growing out of the conflicts which affect our every day problems.

Under a democratic government the decisions which we make as business men, labor unionists, teachers, or clergymen, or the decisions we make as voters, are for the most part decisions affecting our various democratic freedoms and responsibilities. Unless we possess the essential facts and implications of the issues which we must decide, our decisions are perforce based upon misinformation, lack of information, guess-work, or emotion, and hence may be contrary to our own interests. Most of us must rely on the newspapers for virtually all information bearing on these issues or conflicts.

Do local, state, or federal governmental officials create legislative or executive censorship, direct or indirect, to prevent the press from printing essential facts and implications? Does the apathy or lack of interest of readers in these matters make it unprofitable for newspapers to emphasize this more important news? Finally, do publishers, editors, or reporters themselves "take sides" on these issues, and in consequence cause the news to be so written or so edited as to omit or distort some essential facts and implica-

tions? In brief, are newspapers themselves sometimes so operated as to limit the freedom of newspaper readers to obtain essential facts and implications of conflicts affecting their welfare? Insofar as a newspaper is thus conducted it becomes itself a medium for specific propagandas and opinions.

In a recently published study of the Washington press corps made under the auspices of the Social Science Research Council (*The Washington Correspondents,* Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1937, 436 pp., $3.00) Leo C. Rosten discovered through the circulation of several anonymous questionnaires that 60.5 per cent of this top-ranking, relatively high-salaried group of 127 men believe that the press devotes too much space to scandals and sensations while 29.8 per cent believe the contrary and 9.6 per cent are uncertain; that 48.5 per cent believe the news columns are not equally fair to capital and to labor while 43.8 per cent believe that they are equally fair and 7.6 per cent are uncertain; that 86.6 per cent believe, however, that newspapers do not give significant accounts of basic economic conflicts while only 11.4 per cent believe they do and only 1.9 per cent are uncertain; that 63.8 per cent believe the publishers' cry of "Freedom of the Press" in fighting against the NRA code was a ruse while 24.7 per cent accept the cry at face value and 11.4 per cent are uncertain; that 46.2 per cent believe "most papers printed unfair or distorted stories about the Tugwell Pure Foods Bill" while only 21.6 per cent held that the news accounts were fair and the large bloc of 32 per cent was uncertain; that 60 per cent agreed that "It is almost impossible to be objective. You read your paper, notice its editorials, get praised for some stories and criticized for others. You 'sense policy' and are psychologically driven to slant your stories accordingly," while only 34.2 per cent disagreed with this and only 5.6 per cent were uncertain; that 55.5 per cent testified they had seen their writings "played down, cut or killed for 'policy' reasons," while 41.6 per cent held to the contrary and 2.7 per cent were uncertain; that 60.8 per cent held that the correspondents in Washington try to please their editors and 28.3 per cent disagreed; and that 60.6 per cent testified they wrote stories to fit the editorial preconceptions of their employer and only 34.8 per cent testified to the contrary.

A number of individual correspondents told Mr. Rosten (who was guided in his searching inquiry by Professor Charles E. Merriam, chairman of the political science department of the University of Chicago, Professor Harold D. Lasswell, of the University of Chicago, Professor Leonard D. White, and Dr. Charles Ascher) that publishers had brought pressure to bear upon them in various ways to produce a certain news "slant." Mr. Rosten says, "Newspapermen become expert in estimating the pleasure with which their home offices will welcome stories with a particular political emphasis or with particular political implications."

It would be strange indeed if publishers, editors, and reporters, as individuals or as groups and associations, were not affected by emotions, prejudices, and biases irrespective of whether called by these names or designated as convictions, principles, or ideals. Like the rest of us they are profoundly influenced by their own inheritance and environment. They may "take sides" because they are led to do so by their own convictions or biases, or because of pressure applied by readers and advertisers. In this respect they are more or less like business men, teachers, clergymen, and people in general. We believe, however, that they are less like them; that their very trade or vocation, involving as it does daily concern with the scores of conflicts out of which news flows, makes them tend to become less prejudiced, less biased, more skeptical, and more objective with respect to current conflicts than are most citizens.

The Canons of Journalism

In order to find "some means of codifying sound practice and just aspirations of American journalism," The Canons of Journalism, ethical rules of the profession, were adopted by the American Society of Newspaper Editors, April 28, 1923, and have since been endorsed by many state associations and other groups of journalists. One will find in these canons a yardstick to apply to the newspapers they read, a method of determining whether or not these papers are biased in their presentation of news. As printed in *Editor and Publisher,* January 30, 1937, the canons are:

(1) RESPONSIBILITY—The right of a newspaper to attract and hold readers is restricted by nothing but considerations of public welfare. The use a newspaper makes of the share of public attention it gains, serves to determine its sense of responsibility, which it shares with every member of its staff. A

journalist who uses his power for any selfish or otherwise unworthy purpose is faithless to a high trust.

(2) FREEDOM OF THE PRESS—Freedom of the press is to be guarded as a vital right of mankind. It is the unquestionable right by law, including the wisdom of any restrictive statute. To its privileges under the freedom of American institutions are inseparably joined its responsibilities for an intelligent fidelity to the Constitution of the United States.

(3) INDEPENDENCE—Freedom from all obligations except that of fidelity to the public interest is vital.

A. Promotion of any private interest contrary to the general welfare, for whatever reason, is not compatible with honest journalism. So-called news communications from private sources should not be published without public notice of their source or else substantiation of the claims to value as news, both in form and substance.

B. Partisanship in editorial comment which knowingly departs from the truth does violence to the best spirit of American journalism; in the news columns it is subversive of a fundamental principle of the profession.

(4) SINCERITY, TRUTHFULNESS, ACCURACY—Good faith with the reader is the foundation of all journalism worthy of the name.

A. By every consideration of good faith, a newspaper is constrained to be truthful. It is not to be excused for lack of thoroughness, or accuracy within its control, or failure to obtain command of these essential qualities.

B. Headlines should be fully warranted by the contents of the articles which they surmount.

(5) IMPARTIALITY—Sound practice makes clear distinction between news reports and expressions of opinion. News reports should be free from opinion or bias of any kind. This rule does not apply to so-called special articles unmistakably devoted to advocacy or characterized by a signature authorizing the writer's own conclusions and interpretations.

(6) FAIR PLAY—A newspaper should not publish unofficial charges affecting reputation or moral character, without opportunity given to the accused to be heard; right practice demands the giving of such opportunity in all cases of serious accusation outside judicial proceedings.

A. A newspaper should not invade rights of private feelings without sure warrant of public rights as distinguished from public curiosity.

B. It is the privilege, as it is the duty, of a newspaper to make prompt and complete correction of its own serious mistakes of fact or opinion, whatever their origin.

(7) DECENCY—A newspaper cannot escape conviction of insincerity if, while professing high moral purpose, it supplies incentives to base conduct, such as are to be found in details of crime and vice, publication of which is not demonstrably for the public good. Lacking authority to enforce its canons, the journalism here represented can but express the hope that deliberate pandering to vicious instincts will encounter effective public disapproval or yield to the influence of a preponderant professional condemnation.

Concerning any newspaper, therefore, our subscribers may ask questions based on these canons, such questions as: Is it published in accord with the canons of The American Society of Newspaper Editors? Does it attract and hold readers by "nothing but considerations of public welfare"? Is it using its freedom to omit or to distort essential facts relating to conflicts and issues before the community or the nation? Of what does "fidelity to the public interest" consist? When does any private interest become contrary to the general welfare? How are the seven propaganda devices used in news articles, headlines, editorials, and cartoons? (It should be remembered, however, that the use of the propaganda devices is not in itself an evil if they are used in accordance with the canons of journalism and if the opinions or propagandas they carry are scrutinized and analyzed by the newspaper readers.)

Suggestions

If possible, read more than one local newspaper. For purposes of analysis of most propaganda, much news growing out of conflicts of little social significance need not be read. In addition to local papers read a newspaper which prints many more facts and implications arising from conflicts of national and world significance than most local papers can print. (Some of these papers were listed above.) For background reading we suggest: *The Daily Newspaper in America,* by Alfred McClung Lee (The MacMillan Co., New York, 797 pp., $3.50). Published in 1937, it includes discussion of the current labor-employer conflict between the American Newspaper Publishers Association and the American Newspaper Guild. For news growing out of this conflict, and for other significant facts about newspapers as business enterprises read *Editor and Publisher* and *The Guild Reporter.* The November 1937 issue of *Building America* is devoted to the American press.

Volume I FEBRUARY, 1938 *Number 5*

Newspaper Analysis[1]

NEWSPAPERS in any nation mirror the political, economic, social, and religious freedoms and responsibilities, or lack of them, in that nation. In general, there are two types of government, two types of economic systems, two types of theological systems, two types of social groups. On the one hand, there is the authoritarian type. In this, authority flows from the top down and obedience goes from the bottom up. On the other hand, there is the democratic type. In this, in theory and in practice insofar as the organization is actually democratic, authority flows from all members of the group, and obedience as well as authority flows from democratically chosen representatives to the group. Under the democratic theory, officials of a government, church, or any other organization are responsible to the people comprising the group.

In authoritarian states a single will dominates. For that reason there is but one voice permitted, the voice of the dictator or dictatorial group. Other voices are not heard. There is but one opinion, hence but one propaganda; school, radio, cinema, theater, labor and business groups, and newspapers must repeat or mirror that propaganda.

In democratic states there are many wills; hence many voices, many opinions, many propagandas. If the many wills, voices, opinions, and propagandas were to be overtly suppressed in such a state then it would cease being a democratic state and would become an authoritarian state. This, for example, has happened in Italy and Germany, which once had free channels for the communication of information, opinion, and propaganda. In Russia the channels of communication have seldom if ever been open except to one group. During the World War, in the United States, in England, and in France, the authoritarian method of government was employed and only one general mode of propaganda was permitted.

In the authoritarian state the propaganda problem is simple; the authority at the top simply suppresses all propagandas but its own. Concentration camps, imprisonment, and even death are used to prevent other propagandas.

Democracy and Propaganda

In democratic states, such as the United States, there are many propagandas; properly so, if one prefers the democratic to the authoritarian state. Freedom of speech and freedom of the press, as a *Springfield Republican* editorial (September 3, 1937) has pointed out, "necessarily afford full scope for propaganda from everybody, everywhere, any time."

"Free propaganda," *The Springfield Republican* added, "is nothing but free publicity for the views, interpretations, arguments, pleadings, truths and untruths, half-lies and lies of all creation. Propaganda is good as well as bad. 'We are surrounded by clouds of propaganda.' . . . It is up to each of us to precipitate from those clouds the true and the false, the near-true and the near-false, identifying and giving to each classification its correct label. If this task is far beyond the facilities or ability of most of us, the fact has to be accepted as the price we pay for liberty."

"Yet the freest press in the world," the editorial continued, "abuses its privileges shamefully. The deliberate misrepresentation and distortion of truth all the time going on for the promotion of some interest, political, financial, social or patriotic, is staggering."

Under the democratic system, as *The New York Times* (September 1, 1937) suggested editorially, truth and falsehood fight it out in a free and open field. "What is truly vicious," continued *The Times*, "is not propaganda but a monopoly of it."

Pressures on the Press

Full scope for propaganda from everybody, everywhere, any time, is not possible if newspapers exclude from their columns some opinions and propagandas while giving space to others. When this happens one side or the other tends to have the monopoly of propaganda which *The New York Times* holds to be "truly

[1] This is the second of two letters on analyzing newspapers.

vicious." Then we see the violation of significant portions of the Canons of Journalism of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. (See January issue of *Propaganda Analysis.*)

It is frequently asserted that newspaper articles and editorials often are determined by pressure of advertisers and readers. On this point Professor Roscoe Ellard of the School of Journalism, University of Missouri, has prepared for the Institute of Propaganda Analysis the following statement:

"Newspapers have learned that it is a rare business man who is business-like enough to buy space he knows will profit him in a paper that has seriously angered him by editorial policies or news. He will buy advertising less advantageously in order to punish an editor, perhaps to put that editor out of business.

"A point to understand is that it requires adequate power—financial power—for a newspaper to fight a persistent predatory anger which truthful, public-spirited editing may have aroused, either among large advertisers or organized groups of readers. Newspaper investments are huge; operating expenses high; newspapers must publish regularly whether the advertising for each issue is profitable or not. Newspapers need both advertising revenue and constant readers in order to exist.

"A newspaper can offend one or two advertisers—*if it has many*. It can attack a utility. But if it loses any significant proportion of its constant readers, it loses the indispensable service it must sell to the advertiser. Yet it is not the reader who pays for news and comment: the advertiser pays.[2] Journalism, therefore, must weigh each pressure for suppression or support in terms of the newspaper's very existence. Each editor must ask, 'Are we strong enough to withstand this particular pressure? It is apt to cost us $10,000 or $1,000,000—5,000 readers or 50,000 readers.' The problem is not as simple as many critics assume.

"Unless the pressure is unusually strong, the metropolitan daily can abruptly resist — and usually does resist—an economic attempt to coerce. The smaller paper cannot, for the smaller paper needs nearly every advertiser on its books, and nearly every reader on its list in order to pay a sufficiently reasonable dividend to keep its stockholders from withdrawing their money.

"The principal reasons why very strong papers resort at times to propaganda or submit to pressures are two, both psychological, rather than immediately economic. One is the quite sincere class consciousness of either the publisher or stockholders; the other an apathy on the part of readers toward important issues over which they cannot get excited, or which they cannot understand.

"A class-conscious publisher, for instance, lives on a suburban gold coast, belongs to the country club, eats lunch with a banker and an industrialist. This publisher as a young man may have possessed an unprejudiced point of view with plenty of courage to act upon it. Gradually his environment changes his sincere attitudes. Finally he hates to have anything in his paper that seems out of place among 'the best people.' He begins euphemistically and quite honestly to describe as 'in bad taste' the publication of facts or opinions which support an economic or a political philosophy with which his associates do not agree.

"For instance, from a famous historic city, full of tradition and strong social prejudice, a newspaperman writes me this:

"We can laugh at the Townsendites, tell the Legion to mind its own business, inform the politicians that they can run the government, but that we'll run the newspaper—that is, we can tell those people that in their positions as members of the various pressure groups. But their pressure is nevertheless powerful on the ground of our social contact with them and our personal friendship. What we can tell the Townsendite as a Townsendite or the industrial proprietor as a capitalist, we cannot tell the same men as fellow committeemen at the country club, or as the men whose wives gossip with our wives on a trip to Bermuda.

"A newspaperman is only human, and the best of us dislike to have enemies in our intimate social contacts, even though we know we are right. A straight presentation of the news according to the best journalistic standards may offend John Doe whose residential grounds touch ours and whose daughter is engaged to our nephew. So we rationalize that maybe John is right as far as he goes—and then we compromise. God unwilling, and human nature being what it is, we can do no other."

"The fact that reader apathy can also stifle important facts and comment is illustrated by this incident:

"Paper X in a middle western city cam-

[2] Our comment: Some authorities hold that in the long run the reader does pay for advertising, that its cost must be added to the price of the products or services advertised.

paigned for the city manager form of government following an admitted fiasco of inactivity, inefficiency, and political maneuvering with municipal utility funds. Facts and comment in this campaign produced widespread approval over coffee cups at luncheon clubs, dinner parties, and club house tables. But specific procedures of changing the city charter, complexities of city management and the somewhat laborious organization to effect the reform, were obscure, uninteresting, too much trouble.

"No one moved to do anything except talk; readers tired of news and comment about it. The campaign fell of its own weight. Few editors will print columns when they discover that practically no one is reading them.

"Two hitherto unpublished cases of advertising and organized reader pressure follow:

"Metropolitan paper Y published a series of stories on sweat shop conditions in a factory which had branches in other parts of the country. The stories were all substantiated by personal investigation of an experienced reporter and by personal interviews with girls employed in the factory. The factory and various of its branches brought considerable pressure by threats to withdraw its own advertising and to secure the withdrawal of national advertising. Following this—whether because of it no one can say—the same paper published a series of illustrated stories on ideal working conditions in the same factory.

"The editor of a small but old and profitable daily writes me this: 'Pressure constantly is brought to bear upon us, though often it comes more from our advance knowledge of what a certain group's attitude will be on a particular subject than from pressure exerted after publication. For instance, veterans probably hold as strong a threat over small town newspapers as any other group; yet they seldom actually bring pressure to bear after a specific publication. Policies on my paper, and I think on many others with no greater resources than ours, are adopted or modified in advance in an effort to escape later pressure. The "strong sentiments" of other local groups are generally known, and, consciously or unconsciously, many small dailies tread on as few toes as possible without seriously losing character and self-respect.'

"Many cases exist, of course, of valiant and expensive defeats of pressure attempts. My experience is that the vast majority of editors invariably reject what they recognize to be attempts to coerce them when the issue is important, and when refusal to submit is not almost certain to bankrupt them. The problem is very seldom one of bribery; it is one of the wish to continue in business."[8]

The Most Reliable Newspapers

The Washington newspaper correspondents, obviously well-informed in this field, replying anonymously to a questionnaire by Mr. Leo C. Rosten and cited in his book, *The Washington Correspondents* (Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1937), found the following in respective order the most reliable newspapers in the United States: *The New York Times, The Baltimore Sun, The Christian Science Monitor,* the Scripps-Howard papers, *The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, The Washington Star, The New York Herald-Tribune, The Washington Post, The Philadelphia Record,* and *The Kansas City Star.* The least reliable in the order given were reported to be: the Hearst newspapers, *The Chicago Tribune, The Los Angeles Times,* the Scripps-Howard papers, *The Denver Post, The New York Herald-Tribune, The Washington Post, The Philadelphia Record, The Daily Worker,* and *The Philadelphia Inquirer.*

It will be observed that the Washington press corps is divided as to whether certain newspapers should be classified as "most reliable" or "least reliable." It should also be observed that certain newspapers appear exclusively in one category or the other. The first two newspaper organizations in each group were the overwhelming choices of the corps, so that we have *The New York Times* balanced as "most fair and reliable" against the Hearst newspapers as "least fair and reliable"; *The Baltimore Sun* balanced against *The Chicago Tribune.*

[8] For additional citations of effects of pressure on newspapers, see articles by Professor Roscoe Ellard in *Editor and Publisher,* April 10, 1937, in *Education Against Propaganda, Seventh Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies, 1937,* and in *The Quill,* June, 1937. See also: *The Washington Correspondents* by Leo C. Rosten; *Freedom of the Press* by George Seldes. Suggested reading for 1938: *Editor and Publisher,* Room 1700, Times Square Building, New York City (regular subscription $4.00, educational rate $2.00 a year) and *The Guild Reporter,* 1560 Broadway, New York City (regular subscription $3.50, educational and library rate $1.75 a year).

The Press and Political Leadership[1]

By IRVING BRANT

THE greatest shock ever experienced by the newspaper publishers of America was to wake up on the morning of November 4, 1936, and discover that they had no influence in a presidential election. For many years the American press has been ruled by economic forces whose inevitable effect is to destroy the capacity of the press for leadership. But so little is this understood by most publishers that they still regard it as mere popular perversity that the metropolitan newspapers were overwhelmingly for one candidate for President, and the people were overwhelmingly for another.

Since the 1936 election, the efforts of the press have been devoted to two other matters of political importance. Almost unanimously they combated President Roosevelt's plan to reorganize the Supreme Court, and with equal unanimity they engaged in a campaign to discredit Justice Hugo L. Black and compel him to resign from the position to which the President appointed him.

The newspapers take full credit for the defeat of the court plan. They presented the news about it fairly, debated it vigorously, and I think they exerted an important local pressure upon individual senators and congressmen. But the Gallup poll shows conclusively that the President was defeated, not by the newspapers, which had been against him from the start, but by the Supreme Court's reversal of its own constitutional interpretations and by the retirement of Justice Van Devanter. This changed the trend of public opinion, and the newspapers reinforced the trend by praising the new interpretations of the Constitution as fulsomely as they had praised diametrically opposite interpretations a year and two years earlier.

THE newspapers which took part in the campaign against Justice Black are convinced that they performed a noble service to the country. They do not yet observe that they met defeat in their primary, or at least their ostensible objective, which was to force Justice Black off the court, and it will be some years, probably, before the truth dawns on them that the campaign against Justice Black, instead of being a statesman-like effort to protect the Supreme Court against prejudice and bigotry, was in itself a prejudiced and bigoted misuse of the channels of publicity. I say this as one who abhors to the utmost the spirit of the Ku Klux Klan, and as one who despises the political opportunism which makes ambitious men cater not only to this organization but to any other ignoble force, temporary or permanent, that gets in a position to aid or block political preferment.

I BELIEVE that the attitude of the press toward Justice Black will be stamped in time as the most discreditable tour de force of the present journalistic epoch, not because the newspapers were opposed to the Black appointment, not because they produced evidence that he had been a member of the klan, not because they expressed alarm over the possible effect of this klan affiliation, not because they called for Justice Black's resignation or removal. The campaign will be stamped as discreditable because from first to last it was a presentation of news colored to produce a desired effect, and to prevent unbiased judgment by the people. Some day, undoubtedly, there will be a careful analysis of this campaign. I merely wish to suggest, by two or three details, how it departed from the standard of uncolored presentation of the news which is rightly called the foundation of freedom of the press.

The most convincing defense of Justice Black that I have read is a letter written by a Jewish rabbi in Birmingham, Alabama, a man who has been a rabbi more than forty years and has known Mr. Black for twenty-five years. This letter has been read aloud in public addresses, it has been sent to various people over the country. It is a short letter. It is available for publi-

[1] Reprinted by permission from the January, 1938 issue of *Social Education* for distribution with the February Letter of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis, Inc., 130 Morningside Drive, New York City. Mr. Brant, author of *Storm Over the Constitution*, is editor of the editorial page of the St. Louis *Star-Times*. This address was delivered before the National Council for the Social Studies at St. Louis on November 29, 1937.

cation. But so far as I know it has never been published in any newspaper in the United States.

The *New York Times* and other newspapers sent their ace reporters to Birmingham to inquire about the reputation of Mr. Black as to racial and religious prejudice. They found nothing against him, but what they reported in his favor lost force because it came from political sources, the Birmingham postmaster and the governor of Alabama. Not one of these brilliant reporters, apparently, thought of asking the Jewish rabbi whether Justice Black was prejudiced against Jews. And when the rabbi, on his own initiative, came to the defense of Justice Black and told how Black had fought against the Ku Klux Klan and defeated the klan in its effort to drive a Jewish school principal out of the schools of Birmingham, that was not classed as news fit to print.

The newspapers departed still further from journalistic principles in presenting their chief accusation against Justice Black, that he had accepted a life membership in the klan. This charge was published in advance of the evidence on which it was based. The evidence proved to be an admission card, or pass, to klan lodges, with no mention on it or anywhere else of a life membership. Whether this card was or was not a life membership was a matter of opinion, of interpretation. Under the rule of uncolored presentation of the news, it would have been legitimate journalism to publish the fact that Mr. Black received this admission card, and relate the circumstances under which he received it. It would have been equally legitimate to make the claim, editorially, that this admission card was in truth a life membership, or that it was a membership lasting until the card was thrown away, or that it was no membership at all. But the newspapers did not present the uncolored fact and then interpret it. They presented the interpretation as a fact, thus fixing it as a fact in the public mind before disclosing that it was an interpretation. That was not presentation of news. It was propaganda in the news columns.

The final count against Justice Black, and the one that seems to have most weight today, is that he deceived the Senate, either by silence about his klan membership while it was under discussion, or by denying that he had been a member. Immediately after Mr. Black made his radio speech, admitting his former membership in the klan, Senator Borah made the comment that Justice Black had stated the situation as he —Borah—understood it when the Senate voted for confirmation. Here was what appeared to be the material for a journalistic sensation. Senator Borah, during the debate on confirmation, had challenged anybody to prove that Black was connected with the klan. It was Borah's speech, more than anything else, that seemed to convict Black of deceiving his colleagues in the Senate. And then Borah admitted that he knew it all the time. How did he know it? From whom did he learn it, and when? You would think that every newspaper in America would be clamoring for an explanation from Senator Borah. How was his admission received? It was ignored. The *New York Times* wrote a little pip-squeak editorial, pointing to the conflict between Borah's two statements, but failed to draw the obvious conclusion. Did the great news machine of the American press unlimber itself to get the facts? It did not. Why not? Because the evidence would have shown that Justice Black did not deceive the Senate. There was no way on earth by which Senator Borah could reasonably have foreknown the facts set forth by Justice Black in his radio speech, except directly or indirectly, from Black himself.

I HAVE described this campaign of propaganda, not for the sake of defending Justice Black, who will make his own reputation, good or bad, on the Supreme Court, but because it shows more clearly than anything else in recent years what is the matter with the American press. Fundamentally, the campaign was not directed against Justice Black as a member or former member of the Ku Klux Klan, but against him as a man whose record in the Senate created fear that he would be prejudiced against big business. The anti-Black campaign, owing to the racial and religious issues involved, produced an alignment in the public at large far different from the ordinary lines of political and economic cleavage, but the core of it was hostility to Black's economic and social radicalism. That was what set the forces in motion against him. The public response to this campaign was creditable to the instincts of those who thought civil liberties were in danger and to the discernment of those who thought they were not in danger, but the campaign itself, in its genesis and management, has a far more

fundamental importance. It was a controlled departure from the accepted standards of journalism, and it was a departure resulting from economic determinism in the field of newspaper publishing. This economic determinism is what is destroying the power of the press by undermining the confidence of the people in it.

THE metropolitan newspaper is coming to be recognized as a part of American big business. It represents an investment of millions of dollars. Dependence on advertising ties it more closely to the business world. The typical large-city publisher lives and thinks in terms of million-dollar finance. In nearly all the relationships that affect his political and economic opinions, he stands in the same position as the steel manufacturer, the bank president, the mine operator, the public utility magnate, or the department store owner. The newspaper publisher has an interest identical with that of any other big business man in matters affecting stability of investments, the weight and purposes of taxation, relations with labor, redistribution of wealth.

The owner of a newspaper is under a terrific compulsion toward political conservatism, which to him means saving the country, and offers a mighty field for editorial patriotism. Out of such materials the fundamental policy of the American press has been built up. This trend toward conservatism is all the more impressive if you recognize that there are many liberal newspaper publishers in the country, and that great newspaper properties are built up through the popular appeal of liberal policies. The trouble with journalistic liberalism is that it seldom can withstand the strain of great prosperity, and it is not hereditary. Call the roll of the conservative newspapers of America and you will find an amazing number that were built up through militant liberalism, but which through changes of ownership, through changes in family ideals from one generation to the next, or through the sheer pressure of reinvested profits, have become bulwarks of American capitalism in its most reactionary aspects.

WITH this preliminary I invite you to look at the amazing phenomenon we have in the United States today—a political philosophy which we call the New Deal, completely triumphant in national policy as expressed in a presidential election, yet practically unrepresented in that upper stratum of the American press which dignifies itself by the title of the fourth estate. If journalism were quickly responsive to political trends, there would have sprung up long before this a mushroom growth of liberal newspapers, all of them devoted to the New Deal and appealing for the blessings of its followers. Why has there been no such development? For two reasons. First, the cost of establishing a daily newspaper in a large city runs so far into the millions that it can be undertaken only by men of great wealth. The same is true of the purchase of an existing newspaper. Men wealthy enough to buy or establish newspapers are not usually interested in an extension of liberalism. In the second place, the established conservative newspapers protect themselves against public disfavor in a very creditable way. They put out newspapers which satisfy the main necessities and desires of liberal readers, to an extent at least sufficient to discourage the entry of new competition. What are these necessities and desires? To know the news of the world, and to be entertained. A newspaper which presents the news fairly and comprehensively, and which has appealing comic strips, can weather an astounding amount of opposition to its editorial policies.

I believe that the comparative strength of the news columns of American newspapers—their strength in comparison with American editorial columns and in comparison with European news columns—has been due to the necessities of self-defense. Our newspapers have had to do something to compensate for their hostility to the political views of their readers. What they have done is present ordinary political news in relatively unbiased fashion, though still retaining what might be called an institutional bias—for instance, against a labor party, or a strike in the steel industry, or socialism, or Justice Black.

If I may repeat, here is what makes it possible to have a metropolitan press fundamentally out of sympathy with the prevailing thought of the nation. First, a community of interest between newspaper publishers, who are either wealthy or dependent on wealth, and the great business interests with which a majority of the people are in conflict. Second, the tremendous cost of establishing competing liberal newspapers. Third, a defense mechanism by which conservative newspapers offer extensive and comparatively unbiased news re-

ports as recompense for editorial hostility to liberalism.

I doubt whether this is a permanent alignment. I do not believe it is possible for any political philosophy to remain dominant in the United States over a period of years without forging an instrument for its expression in journalism. However, the inescapable fact is that we have no press today representing the dominant political thought of the country, and there is no immediate prospect of such a press being established on a national scale. I look upon that fact as the most dangerous single factor in American politics. It tends to paralyze the legislative branch of government, rendering it unable to deal with hopes and demands based upon economic distress, and by this frustration tends to drive the nation through chaos to despair.

WE have, it is true, the radio. The radio has been a factor in emancipation of the people from sole reliance upon the press, and when I say emancipation I mean emancipation. It is possible now for two candidates for President, or more than two, to go before the people of the entire nation and make their pleas for election without being dependent in the slightest degree upon the goodwill of the newspapers. If the newspapers distort a speech by unfair headlines or an improper summary, the people have a criterion of their own—the memory of what they heard with their own ears—to correct the wrong impression. Also, through the radio, the personality of candidates for office may be presented with a skill limited only by the personality itself. And if that personality is too alluring in its appeal, the newspaper next day offers, in cold type, the text by which the first judgment may be corrected. The radio may have sins of its own to answer for, but in the choosing of a national executive it has given political democracy an instrument for its fulfillment.

To a much lesser degree, this holds true also in the election of United States senators, congressmen, and the governors of states. The radio is an adequate forum for debate among all contenders for important office. What happens, however, once these officers are elected? The President continues to carry his policies to the people, over the radio and through the columns of the newspapers.

AS long as the President maintains this direct appeal, and as long as the people continue to look upon him as their friend and champion, he is impregnable to the criticism of a hostile press. But what about senators and congressmen and governors and state legislators? What part do they play in the fashioning of a permanent political policy? And what influence does the press have upon them?

What we call the New Deal exists as an unwritten compact, undefined in its terms but definite in its objectives, between President Roosevelt and the 27,000,000 voters who reelected him a year ago. Since that time, thanks to a rebellion in Congress against virtually every item in the President's program, and to tactical mistakes by the President himself, there has been no advance in a year's time toward the underlying objectives. I do not wish to advance the argument that, in these differences of opinion, the President is right and Congress is wrong. But let me present this thought. Suppose that on some occasion when the President is taking one of his periodic trips upon an American warship, the magazine explodes. Or suppose that an infected tooth produces a similar result. What would be left of the New Deal? What would be left of a functioning American government?

Now I know there are some who will say that the President has absorbed the government into his own hands. But, if you eliminate him, you have everything that the government had in 1932—a conservative Congress, a Vice President, in line for the presidential succession, who is not strikingly different in social and economic outlook from Herbert Hoover. In brief, if President Roosevelt should disappear you would have precisely the kind of government that would result from his defeat by a conservative.

I am not so narrow in my conception of democracy as to believe that a freely chosen conservative government, reflecting the calm judgment of a majority of the people, would be incapable of handling the country's affairs. But I can conceive of no more dangerous situation than to have a nationally dominant and highly emotional liberalism represented solely by the chief executive and a few of his aids, while all other branches of the government are secretly or openly hostile even to the broad objectives of the President's policies, and are looking only for a chance to sabotage them. I can conceive of

no more dangerous alternative to such a frustrated liberalism than to have it lead to a change of political control based on disillusion and despair, as it may easily do in a period of renewed depression and general unemployment.

WHAT lies ahead of us if the New Deal fails? I tell you that if the political future is determined by the inability of the Roosevelt administration to deal with basic economic problems, what lies ahead is the loss of hope by tens of millions of people, a devastating war between capital and labor, an imminent collapse of the business structure, a reaching out for control of the government, and a choice at the polls between a far more radical New Deal and the concealed fascism of big business.

AGAINST this prospect what have you? You have the whole burden of constructive leadership thrown upon one man in the White House, and that leadership rendered abortive because there is no articulate public opinion to support a genuine attack upon the destructive economic forces that periodically paralyze the industrial life of the nation. What have we had since 1933? First, a makeshift New Deal whose errors were intensified by the inability of Congress to offer constructive criticism growing out of a basic sympathy. Second, a New Deal which a hostile Congress has whittled down and compromised and rendered as abortive as possible. And today, a New Deal threatened with total disruption because a periodic slump in business, caused chiefly by monopolistic price control and profiteering, creates a hope in Congress that the people may turn against President Roosevelt.

This is not government. It is chaos. It offers our country the stability of a powder keg in a cigaret factory. The government of the United States, and the people of the United States, have never in their entire history faced so precarious a future as at the present moment. At bottom, this must be charged to the power, the blindness, and the obstinacy of a capitalist business system which would destroy itself rather than follow a painful road to salvation. But part of it represents the tragedy of the American press, which is both a part of the business system and its most powerful lobbyist. If the present occupant of the White House, thanks to personality and the radio, has been able to emancipate himself from the veto power of the American press, the same emancipation can not be said to have been attained to any appreciable extent by the lesser figures in our government—lesser men individually, but collectively as important as the President, and in an ideal sense more important.

THE collective weight of American newspapers lies like a mountain of woodpulp upon Congress and state legislatures. The coercive force of a newspaper, directed against specific legislation, bears lightly upon the President, but heavily upon a local congressman. By mere silence, the press exposes senators and congressmen to the savage attacks of a business lobby, and, when the President's position is weakened by a business recession, the total lack of a public press supporting his objectives permits a sweep of power to the forces in opposition.

The almost solid alignment of metropolitan newspapers against the Roosevelt administration is the entrenching force behind a disharmony that may wreck our government at any great increase of economic strain. The newspapers of America furnish no driving force for social reform that touches the economic system. They are a positive handicap in economic reform. And they tend to freeze the legislative branch of government.

WHEN the United States government, in 1933, accepted the responsibility for public action to restore business activity and insure social security, it did not simply enter upon a period of emergency activity, to be discarded as soon as there were signs of an industrial boom. It moved from one era in national life to another. It accepted the fruits of the industrial revolution and the financial revolution—steel, steam, and electricity in the field of industry, the creation of the corporation in the field of finance.

We entered a new world in 1933, and entered it suddenly. Barriers which had held for thirty years, and some which had held for a hundred years, were suddenly broken down. We had to catch up with Europe in the field of social security, and part company with Asia in the ruination of land. We had to, and still have to, deal with the incredible sight of a starving, ragged, slum-dwelling population in a nation

with the greatest wealth-producing capacity in all the history of the human race. We had to deal with the problem of a business machine that periodically breaks down, a financial system that knows no law of survival except the law of the jungle, and a society so interlocked and integrated and technologically interdependent that the maintenance of business activity becomes an inescapable function of government.

TO what extent is this development in human affairs admitted and acted upon by the American press? It is impossible to point to one important constructive step taken in the United States in the last eight years which represents either the inventiveness, the initiative, or the supporting activity of the American press. For a few months in 1933, during the bank holiday and in the preliminary stages of the NRA, there was an emotional response to the initiative shown by President Roosevelt.

From the day the newspapers were invited to put a curb on child labor in their own industry, from the day they were asked to limit the hours of their employes to forty per week and to pay reporters a minimum wage of twenty-five dollars, from the day they were told that the law guaranteed newspaper employes the right to organize for collective bargaining, from that day the metropolitan newspapers of the United States have been substantially regimented against the New Deal, the agent of regimentation being the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

Incidentally, may I say at this point that it is a great pleasure to work for a newspaper whose publisher does not care what I say about the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

For four years the American Newspaper Publishers Association has been deluging its members with bulletins. First it attempted to regiment the editorial opinion of the country against the wage and hour and collective bargaining provisions of the NRA. Then it launched a collective campaign against ratification of the Child Labor Amendment. Finally it turned its guns upon the National Labor Relations Act, not only furnishing arguments which editors might use to prove the unconstitutionality of that law, but advising publishers to refuse to obey it.

I do not know to what extent the ANPA has influenced editorial opinion, but I do believe that the attempt of metropolitan newspapers to protect their own system of child labor, euphemistically styled the "little merchant system," has been one of the principal causes of public distrust of the press. I believe that the open and obvious anti-labor bias of a great majority of our larger newspapers, and the smug assumption that readers cannot penetrate the veil of pretended impartiality, have been more potent than the presidential election in discrediting metropolitan journalism among the masses of the American people.

TO whatever extent the ANPA has succeeded in imposing the views of its conservative directorate upon member newspapers over the country, to that extent it has weakened the American press as a free institution, and to that extent it has reduced the confidence of the American people in the press of the country. I object to this attempt at regimentation not because it is conservative, but because it weakens the basis of our American democracy. I would object to it just as strongly if it came from liberals. Any attempt at the centralized control of opinion is an attack on the freedom of the human mind. The attempted regimentation of the press by the American Newspaper Publishers Association is most dangerous as a symptom, a symptom of that automatic regimentation which comes from a common view of economic interest, applied in the form of political pressure upon the local representatives of a national administration.

I would rather see the American government wholly conservative, by a vote of the people, than to see the hopes and aspirations of the people subjected to recurring disillusion. That disillusion we shall have if we go on, building up hope through presidential promises to the people, only to see them torn down through legislative compromise or administrative failure. The spoils system is placed above administrative efficiency. Why? Chiefly because there is no recognition in Congress, and no driving force in the American press compelling recognition, that administrative efficiency must be put behind the present undertakings of the government, if we are to escape national chaos.

We face the threat of ruinous inflation of prices and the collapse of government credit. Why? Because, through the will of the people, and the compelling force of the industrial revolution, we are permanently committed to costly social enterprises, but Congress does not recog-

nize this fact, and the President does not dare propose taxation as a substitute for borrowing until the people are educated to it. What does the press contribute to a solution of this problem? It raises a cry for retrenchment, which would be a valuable cry indeed if intelligently directed, but the cry becomes merely a querulous complaint when it forms a part of indiscriminate protest against the social and economic program of the New Deal. If inflation comes upon us to a disastrous extent, the fault will rest largely with the newspapers of America, which refuse to correlate social objectives with the costs of government, and watch like hungry vultures for the President to make a mistake which will let them pounce on him and destroy him and his program.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT, it has been pointed out, has an uncanny sense of timing. He knows when not to do a thing. Build the obstacles too high and this means that the time to do a thing is never. It means losing precious years, wasting efforts, junking vast enterprises, and final failure. If failure comes, and disillusion and chaos with it, it will not be President Roosevelt's fault. It will be because there is no agency of public opinion consistently building with him, and working to fuse the three branches of government into an instrumentality for carrying out the will of the people.

Never in American history was there so great need to move from unified political thought into unified political organization and action. Against this necessary step, the American press, responsive to the narrowest interpretation of the economic interest of its owners, stands as the chief obstacle. I hope that it may not be written down in history as the stumbling block over which American democracy is to fall.

A 1938 Press Job[1]

NEVER in American history was there so great need to move from unified thought into unified political organization and action. Against this necessary step the American press, responsive to the narrowest interpretation of the economic interest of its owners, stands as the chief obstacle. I hope that it may not be written down in history as the stumbling block over which American democracy is to fall."

Those words were not written by a newspaperneedler. They are the conclusion of Irving Brant, editor of the editorial page of the *St. Louis Star-Times,* to an article in the current issue of *Social Education.* He is a newspaperman of many years' experience, an expert on constitutional questions. If his general sympathies run toward the New Deal, they are not colored by prejudices which disqualify him as a critic of newspapers.

His conclusion is based upon premises of continuing gravity to newspapermen:

That newspapers' treatment of the Black case "from first to last was a presentation of news colored to produce a desired effect to prevent unbiased judgment by the people." The newspaper case against Black, Brant charges, rested on the fear that he would be prejudiced against big business.

That a political philosophy which we call the New Deal, "completely triumphant in national policy, is yet practically unrepresented in that upper stratum of the American press which dignifies itself by the title of the fourth estate." He notes that newspapers which present the news fairly and comprehensively—as he concedes most do—and which have appealing comic strips, can weather astounding opposition to editorial policies.

He doubts this can be a continuing phenomenon, but while he believes that no political philosophy can remain dominant here without forging itself an instrument for journalistic expression, he sees no immediate prospect of that instrument. Its lack, he believes, is the most dangerous single factor in American politics—tending to paralyze the legislature, rendering it unable to deal with hopes and demands based upon economic distress, and by this frustration, tending to drive the nation through chaos to

[1] Reprinted by permission from the editorial page of the January 22, 1938 issue of *Editor and Publisher* for distribution with the February Letter of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis, Inc., 130 Morningside Drive, New York City.

despair. If radio is the answer for the President, it is not for the legislators, which are immediately subject to local newspaper information.

"By mere silence," he argues, "the press exposes senators and congressmen to the savage attacks of a business lobby, and, when the President's position is weakened by a business recession, the total lack of a public press supporting his objectives permits a sweep of power to the forces in opposition. . . . The newspapers of America furnish no driving force for social reform that touches the economic system. They are a positive handicap in economic reform. And they tend to freeze the legislative branch of government."

* * *

If you grant that there is a New Deal which commands the overwhelming support of the country on concrete issues, it is hard to reject Mr. Brant's conclusions. Even without granting that premise, it must be admitted that the variously construed missions of the New Deal have met with limited newspaper sympathy, though we do not accept the dictum that "newspapers furnish no driving force for social reform that touches the economic system" or that "they are a positive handicap to economic reform."

Those terms have to be defined again. Possibly the two major economic reforms effected by Mr. Roosevelt have been the insurance of bank deposits and the regulation of stock speculation. There was no strong newspaper opposition to either the FDIC or the SEC, nor to the divorce of affiliates from deposit banking.

Newspapers strenuously opposed the NRA, apart from the fight on the newspaper code. NRA was a "reform" with failure written on its face from birth. It was an effort to reverse the generation-long battle against monopoly, coupled with an unworkable political device to appease labor. The act could be operated until the country was conditioned to its necessity, which it could not be in the brief minutes between enactment and attempted enforcement five years ago.

It failed, not because some newspapers fought the 40-hour week and the child labor clauses. It failed, even before the Supreme Court invalidated it, because our business and political intelligence of the day could not make it succeed.

Certainly our technical achievements in manufacture and distribution have outrun our understanding of them. The men who devised the Detroit assembly lines 25 years ago had no notion then that they were creating a new economic order; they were simply taking one step after another in what they considered progress. Some got rich, and their work changed the face of the country—but today few understand all of its implications. Yet those implications must be understood and projected into the future, if we are to govern them.

We believe other editors than Mr. Brant have struggled hard and honestly with this problem, which is fundamental. We believe they want it solved before its weight pulls down the national economy, and we do not believe they want it solved in the selfish interest of the mythical "60 Families," or by further submergence of the "forgotten third."

The job involves redistribution of wealth—but a poll of the Congress, the Cabinet, and citizens of all strata would find few in agreement on how it can be done and to what extent. Newspaper editors and publishers are in no better accord. To say that an actual or tacit conspiracy exists among them to balk social progress is absurd. Some have been mulishly bigoted in their fight on the New Deal; the majority have counseled against moves which they considered unsound. Perhaps they have not been too convincing. There has been so much expediency and clever thinking in Washington that it is difficult to follow the general trend, or even to find one, of genuine New Deal policy.

Let us examine the idea that obstructive newspaper tactics paralyze the legislature. If most newspapers opposed Mr. Roosevelt's plan to reform the Supreme Court, so did a strong minority of the President's friends in Congress—before newspapers had printed a line of news or comment. That Congress was paralyzed as a legislative body, but can it be said that newspaper comment intimidated Senator Wheeler, Senator Borah, Senator Johnson, Senator Ashurst, or Representative Rayburn? Or Senator Guffey, on the other side? Newspapers did not cause and could not correct that paralysis, which traced directly to Mr. Roosevelt's misconception of his mission.

We cannot go along with Mr. Brant in the concept that the voters gave Mr. Roosevelt any specific mandate in 1936. They did manifest confidence in his general policies, but we doubt that any went to the polls understanding clearly

what Mr. Roosevelt meant when he said "in my first term, the forces of reaction have met their match; in my next, they will meet their master." That is political rhetoric. In the light of recent events, it doesn't stand analysis.

Those events also brought a message to the press. The panic, depression or recession or whatever it is that now grips us, arose, we believe, from the usual combination of greed and ignorance. From the top-salaried men of the country down, we are almost as ignorant of economic facts as we are of Tagalog. The big manufacturer presses for more and more production as prices rise, and is amazed when he finds the stuff backing up on his sidings and his plant shut down. His workman, certain that the sun is now shining for good, hocks the next 18 months' wages to buy a radio, automobile, refrigerator, and anything else that can be financed—and is equally amazed when he finds there isn't enough left for a needed suit of clothes.

He and the manufacturer share the blame for the paralysis of business, and the degree of culpability for each isn't important. All are playing with forces they don't understand. None can say with certainty that we ever emerged from the panic that culminated in 1933, and that the years between 1933 and 1937 were not a fool's paradise. No one yet knows how far government can go with borrowed money, nor how heavily taxes can be imposed without drying up the source.

To argue that we cannot learn the answers except by experience is to declare that we are still in the age when men feared eclipses as signs of divine anger. Those answers won't be found in any panacea. They won't be found by calling names. They won't be found by trying to split Congress to the point where legislative action is impossible. They won't be found in roars of "Beat Roosevelt," echoing Senator Vandenburg's contribution to the 1936 Republican convention.

Which brings us to the point where we are in substantial agreement with Irving Brant. The job of informing and of co-ordinating information is the newspaper's above any other agency. It is a reporting job. The basic need is information. If the White House had it, we should not be having today's blank-cartridge battles. If Congress had it, we should not be witnessing a continuation of the 1937 sterility, in the face of the country's plight.

We believe that nearly 2,000 newspapers, with selfishly patriotic motives, can perform this vital service. We believe that the press can bring about the mutual understanding between business and government and the public—as operators, producers, and consumers—that is essential to permanent progress. It will take real investigation and convincing writing, functions of the press which no other agency can perform. We see that as the great opportunity in 1938.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES AND DISCUSSION NOTES

1. To understand newspapers better and to become more familiar with our own newspaper reading habits, conduct the following experiment: Ask each member of the group to make three lists.[2] *List A* should contain the following information: names of papers read regularly; average daily and Sunday time devoted to each paper; parts of the paper or papers regularly read (e.g., columnists, editorials, society, sports, comics, foreign news, local news, sensational news, headlines only, advertisements, etc.). *List B* should contain the same information if you had only fifteen minutes a day for newspaper reading. *List C* should contain the following information: If you were advising a high school student how best to devote one hour a day to newspaper reading, which newspaper or newspapers and which parts would you suggest his reading?

2. Compare these lists. Do they help explain the size of the modern newspaper? How do our backgrounds and interests influence our reading? Do we read as intelligently as we would have high school students read?

3. Go through the main papers in your city and check (√) those headlines which in your opinion deserve greater prominence; place an *X* beside those which you believe deserve less prominence. Indicate where you think these should be placed (front page, inside, second section, etc.). Compare your placing with those of other members of the group. Discuss the possible reasons the editors of the newspapers

[2] This experiment as well as all group experiments should be conducted with a spirit of honesty, fair play, and desire to see individual activities in group relationships. It should be borne in mind that the purpose of such experiments and discussion is not to lay bare individual foibles but to build a composite picture of activity based upon individual activities.

had for placing the headlines the way they did. What are the reasons for your own placing?

4. Discuss in the group the relative importance which should be given in the press to crime, labor disputes, international wars, unusual happenings like the birth and activities of the Dionne Quintuplets, sports, scientific experiments, local politics, education, etc. It will be necessary to define clearly some basic values generally recognized by modern society to which all these can be referred.

5. Before reading the news account of a current important public speech, read the complete text as printed in the paper. Indicate briefly how you would have reported the speech, what headlines you would have written, what editorial comments you would have made. Read the speech again and underline the parts of the speech which you believe the speaker emphasized by a rise in his voice or a dramatic pause. Does this make any difference in the way you would have reported the speech? Compare your reporting, headlines, and editorial comments with those of several newspapers.

6. Make a dictionary of Name Calling (from news accounts, quotations, editorials, headlines, cartoons, etc.) for the newspapers which you read. Add similar illustrations to your "Blah" Dictionary.

7. The American Constitution and the "Bill of Rights" frequently mention various kinds of freedom to be preserved. Are these freedoms modified and explained by the Constitution's emphasis on the common good, "the public welfare"? What does this mean for editorial policy? Does advertising policy affect editorial policy? Do pressure groups influence editorial policy? Compare freedom of the press in the United States with such freedom in other countries.

8. Discuss the difficulty of unbiased news gathering and reporting. Attend a strike or political rally with a friend who has political and economic views different from your own. Stay together so that you hear and see the same things, but do not talk about what you see and hear. Interview speakers, leaders, and members of the audience. (This may be done separately.) Then separate and write as accurate and unbiased a newspaper article as possible. Ask the group to discuss the two reports, their differences in tone and bias, emphasis, omissions, etc.

9. Discuss the effect of one's home training, education, reading, interests, etc., on reporting. Of what does background consist? How much of it is determined by the people with whom we work, eat, play, talk? The place where we live? The books, periodicals, and papers we read?

10. Discuss what might be termed "trivial" and what "important" in daily news. Give each member of the group a copy of the same paper. Ask every one to mark each article with a *T* for trivial, a *U* for undecided, or an *I* for important. Total the *T*'s, *U*'s, and *I*'s for every article. Does this experiment help us understand better the complicated task of editing a newspaper?

11. Make a collection of cartoons and pictures expressing points of view with which you agree. Make a similar collection for points of view with which you disagree. You will doubtless wish to include such subjects as war and peace, prominent national and international statesmen, taxation, other political, social, and economic developments. Discuss the factual accuracy of these cartoons. Their educational and informative value. Are all cartoons propaganda?

12. Discuss the difference in form, intent, and effectiveness of such propaganda methods as the subtleties of a newspaper's policy and lay-out, "colored" news reporting and headlines, the more obvious propaganda of editorials and cartoons.

13. In connection with the study of newspapers as molders and reflectors of public opinion and propaganda, it would be well to consider the similar effect of magazines. Make a list of all the magazines regularly read by the members of the group. Indicate the number of readers for each magazine. From as many local newsstands as possible secure the average weekly or monthly sales for these and more widely read magazines. Secure similar figures from the local library. If possible, secure similar figures from the magazines themselves for local subscriptions. Compare these magazines with the magazine reading in Middletown. (Cf. Robert S. and Mary Merrell Lynd, *Middletown,* pp. 158, 231, and 239 (1929), and *Middletown in Transition,* pp. 258–260 (1937), New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.) Study several issues of each magazine. For each list the proportions of space devoted to such subjects as fiction, women's and household articles; entertainment; informative articles on national and international affairs, economics, business, politics, education; pictures and cartoons; editorials; advertisements; etc. Compare these figures. Discuss the influence of these magazines on the readers. Discuss the magazines which in your opinion are the best for the subjects in which you are interested. Are you now forming your opinions on the basis of limited reading and discussion? If you had more time for reading, which magazines would you add to your shelf? Can you find time to read these?

Volume I MARCH, 1938 *Number 6*

The Movies and Propaganda

CONTROVERSY has recently broken out over alleged propaganda in the newsreels. The National Council for the Prevention of War has criticized certain of the Panay films as providing "a running track of dialogue dripping with fiery tirades directed against the Japanese and having an unquestioned effect of arousing the American temper." One explanation of the sinking of the Panay is that it was deliberately planned by the Japanese to gauge American public opinion, to determine whether the aroused American propaganda against Japan would be strong enough to alter Japanese plans for further aggression in China. The same explanation is applied to Japanese attacks on British subjects and property in Shanghai, and to Japanese attacks on Russians in the Amur region. Whether or not the Japanese committed these acts for trial balloon purposes, it is certain that the Japanese authorities are using American, British, and Russian responses to the acts to measure opinion in America, Britain, and Russia, and are proceeding accordingly.

The March of Time release, *Inside Nazi Germany, 1938,* "is a flaming pro-Nazi story," according to Martin Proctor quoted by *The New York Post.* Warner Brothers refused to show this film in any of their 460 theaters. But Dr. William E. Dodd, retiring United States Ambassador to Germany, declared: "The members of every American family, young and old, who believe in liberty and democracy should by all means see *Inside Nazi Germany* which March of Time has so brilliantly produced. It tells the truth about Hitler's government."

Apparently there is little doubt in the minds of these critics as to the power of such films to "influence others to some predetermined end by appealing to their thoughts and feelings."

The motion picture dramatist, like the writer of popular fiction, knows the keys to strike to arouse the proper emotions. He secures stock responses by appeals to our interest in sex and sentimentality; violence and excitement; nationalistic symbols; sweetness, optimism, and happy endings; wish-fulfilment through reveries and day dreams; popular prejudices. These appeals and interests are combined in popular stereotypes which can play significant parts in conscious or unconscious propaganda. For example:

1. *The successful culmination of a romance will solve most of the dilemmas of the hero and the heroine.* What young lovers are going to live on in a world of insecurity and unemployment reaches the screen only rarely, as, for example, in *Gentlemen Are Born.*

2. *Catch the criminal and you solve the crime problem.* Only rarely does a movie give us some insight into unemployment, slums, insecurity, as causes for crime; notable exceptions are *Dead End, The Devil Is a Sissy,* and *I Am a Fugitive From a Chain Gang.*

3. *War and the preparation for war are thrilling, heroic, and glamorous.* For one *Broken Lullaby, All Quiet on the Western Front,* or *The Road Back,* we have had dozens of films such as *West Point of the Air, Annapolis Farewell, Flirtation Walk, Shipmates Forever, Here Comes the Navy, Devil Dogs of the Air,* and *Navy Blue and Gold.*

4. *The good life is the acquisitive life, with its emphasis on luxury, fine homes and automobiles, evening dress, swank and suavity.* Note, for example, the economic level of residences shown in a random selection of 40 feature motion pictures. Of the 228 different residences appearing in these movies, 22 per cent were classifiable as ultra-wealthy, 47 per cent as wealthy, and 25 per cent moderate. Only 4 per cent were shown as visibly poor. Note, too, that poverty on the screen is not infrequently a bit romantic. It is not the mean, bitter, grinding poverty of the slums of our cities and share-cropper regions. Further, when we note the heavy emphasis in selection of leading male characters from the commercial and professional groups, with almost no representation from the ranks of labor, we get some explanation of the lop-sided notion of the world of workaday living held by many young people.

5. *Certain races, nationalities, or minority groups are comical, dull-witted, or possess traits that mark them as greatly different from and inferior to native white Americans.* We see this in the portrayal of the Negro in rôles of inferiority, in the monocled and simpering Englishman. The motion picture, of course, is not the only medium of communication that propagandizes in this fashion. Studies of the

stereotypes held by college students show that many influences have been at work in producing grossly inaccurate portraits of races and nationalities.

Thus, the motion picture while giving people enjoyment through fantasy, gives this enjoyment within the framework of commonly accepted stereotypes and thereby exerts an influence which tends to strengthen them and to prevent criticism of them. Only in rare instances is it an agency for illuminating problems of human conduct, for developing social insight, for encouraging a review of our beliefs and customs, of our modes of governments, and of the relationships between peoples and races. Contenting themselves with evoking stock responses to such stereotypes as those listed, the motion picture producers provide few films which give opportunity for other responses. Eight major producing companies dominate the film industry. They are influenced not alone by the stereotypes common to America but also by stereotypes agreeable to the censors of foreign countries. According to percentages derived from the 1937 income estimates reported in a recent issue of *Variety*[1] 44.6 per cent of the gross income of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, 37.2 per cent of the income of Paramount, and 35 per cent of the income of Twentieth Century-Fox came from foreign sources. Small wonder, then, that *It Can't Happen Here* was not produced, that British imperialism has often been shown in a favorable light by Hollywood movies.

An easy, quick, and partially valid reply to the charges of emphasis on certain stereotypes is that such emphasis is essential to profitable mass appeal. Yet this answer is too facile. We know that such motion pictures as *Dead End, The Story of Louis Pasteur,* and *The Life of Émile Zola* have played profitably to huge audiences. We know that the policy of Warner Brothers in producing clarifying social documents such as *They Won't Forget, Black Legion, I Am a Fugitive,* have met with financial success.

To recognize and deal with propaganda in a motion picture we must ask:

1. What are the assumptions about life and human nature on which this film rests? 2. What values or goals do the characters in the play consider important? 3. Do we think that they are important? 4. Is this film a defense of things as they are? 5. Is it an argument for change? 6. Were the problems of the characters remote from contemporary conditions or were they closely related to the realities of today? 7. Were the relationships between the characters on the screen traditional? 8. Would they be acceptable to intelligent people today? 9. Who wants us to think this way? 10. What are his interests? 11. Do they coincide with the interests of ourselves, of most Americans?

To determine the nature and direction of the motion picture as a carrier of propaganda we must ask: *What rôle does it play and what rôle might it play in American life?* Shall it provide entertainment judged only by its power to get people's minds off uninspiring work, dreary surroundings, defeats, dissatisfactions? Shall it provide social illumination, contribute something to people's understanding of themselves and of the world in which they live? Shall it provide both, as both have been provided by the great creators of literature and the drama? The characteristic of the greatest literature is that it enlightens while it also entertains; it gives pleasure through bringing people to understand and to respond more fully to what they did not understand before.

Such a conception of the rôle of the motion picture enables us to look with favor upon delightful fantasy or humor as exemplified in *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs, It Happened One Night,* and *Mr. Deeds Goes to Town.* It leads us to praise the portrayal of social realities as found in *Dead End, The Life of Émile Zola,* or *The Story of Louis Pasteur.* At the same time it challenges those motion pictures which are vehicles for pseudo-realities, incorrect generalizations, and misleading stereotypes.

Analysts of propaganda must ask what part the motion picture plays in effecting or hampering social change. Does it reduce or increase intelligent social criticism? In England, for example, Lord Harewood defended the institution of betting, many of the consequences of which he recognized as undesirable, on the ground that it occupied public interest and attention, and so prevented people from becoming dissatisfied with the conditions under which they are living. Is the same defense made for movies based on the common stereotypes we have listed?

To ask that the motion picture should contribute to social enlightenment is to ask no more than that it should do something which has always been done by great novelists and dramatists. It is asking that the motion picture industry should do more of what it has already done so well in such films as *The Life of Émile*

[1] *Variety,* January 19, 1938. V. 129, No. 6, pp. 1 and 8.

Zola. The success of such films proves that public taste is capable of appreciating films of much greater social value than the majority that are produced by the industry. Here the student of propaganda must ask why the industry seems to lag behind, and even to hold back, the development of public taste. He might also ask whether the praise that has been given to the motion picture by some distinguished men in the industry on the grounds that it allayed social discontent, was not perhaps a factor in the situation.

Newsreels

The newsreels are another branch of the theatrical film industry. All newsreel companies claim that they are impartial in presenting news. Nevertheless, an analysis of newsreels made by two different companies showed that in 1930 there were four times as many items favoring the wet side of the prohibition question as the dry side, that there were twelve times as many items dealing with war and defense preparations and the like as with peace. We know, too, of the failure of the Paramount Company to release at once newsreels showing the killing of workers in the Republic Steel strike in Chicago. This failure to release the films was of undoubted value in building up public antipathy to the alleged violence of the strikers. Newsreels, too, were used in California to defeat Upton Sinclair. The following quotation from an article by R. S. Ames in *Harper's Magazine* for March, 1935, describes this activity:

> . . . But by mid-October conservatives of both parties realized that Sinclair could be stopped by no ordinary methods. . . . So the screen entered politics. Surprised patrons of neighborhood movie houses were suddenly treated to pictures of an indigent army disembarking from box cars on Los Angeles sidings. These repulsive-looking bums appeared to have swarmed in from all corners of the United States, determined to enjoy the easy pickings of the promised Sinclair régime. . . . This interpretation of current events was strangely moving, although those with critical eyes wondered why the vagrants were wearing make-up; and some with good memories at once recognized excerpts from the Warner Brothers' previous film fiction *Wild Boys of the Road*. The Sinclair cohorts exposed this fraud and the movies were forced to abandon the use of stock shots thereafter.[2]

In spite of these criticisms, a careful examination of newsreel content over a period of years shows that they have presented unbiased factual information on many current controversies.

Advertising Films

Most non-theatrical movies are so-called advertising films. They may advertise a product directly or they may, as do many insurance companies, deal with a field of health and merely present the name or insignia of the company on the title. They may represent *institutional* advertising in which a number of allied industries have pooled their resources to advertise not a specific advertised brand but the product itself, like lumber or cement. Or they may show scenic beauties and splendors in various parts of the world and may be made available through steamship companies and foreign governments.

Schools receive many films of this type.[3] The magazine, *Business Week*, October 30, 1937, stated:

> When a large public utility heard of the nonprofit work of the National Educational Film Foundation, Inc., 11333 Chandler Blvd., North Hollywood, Calif., it donated $60,000 worth of film negative which it could no longer use in its own public relations work. This film will be recut and re-edited to make educational films for free distribution to school children all over the country. The Foundation is looking for more negatives and will grant publicity privileges under certain restrictions.

What can be done about advertising films? Here are questions which one superintendent of schools has pupils in his high school apply:

> Most of our films that are shown by the school are furnished free by the various commercial organizations. In some cases we only pay transportation charges, and in some cases we receive them without any charge. Why do you think these commercial firms furnish these films for schools?
>
> The film you will see is furnished us by the National Industrial Council, a federation of national, state, and local industrial associations, sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers. After you have seen the film, will you fill out below why they should be interested in furnishing this film to the schools?
>
> What ideas did they try to get across to you?
>
> Sometimes the only true picture is the whole picture. True, isolated facts may be misleading, if other

[2] Ames, Richard Sheridan. "The Screen Enters Politics, Will Hollywood Produce More Propaganda?" *Harper's Magazine*, 170: 473–4.

[3] See the article by S. H. Walker and Paul Sklar, "Business Finds Its Voice," in the February, 1938 issue of *Harper's Magazine*, 176: 317–329.

true facts are not related. Do you think that certain essential facts were not brought out which should have been brought out? If so, what would you suggest was ignored in this picture?

In general, do you think that the schools should show films furnished to us by different organizations free to our classes as part of our educational program?

When you see one of our films, how do you try to tell if it is

1. Advertising?
2. Propaganda for an idea or ideas?
3. Portrayal of facts?[4]

Government Films

Recently the government has produced films which deal with critical social issues, for example, *The Plow that Broke the Plains* (Dust Bowl) and *The River* (Flood Control). The WPA also has produced and released a number of motion pictures dealing with its work.

These government efforts have been bitterly attacked, highly praised. The analyst of propaganda must determine, first, the rôle that any government agency should play in informing the public of what it is doing; second, the extent to which this information is misleading and biased in its presentation; third, whether the government should rest its case with merely sensitizing its viewers to a significant social problem such as soil erosion and flood control, or whether it should move on from there to offer specific solutions of these problems.

[4] Our comment: All three of these may be propaganda.

Suggested Readings

The following books are suggested for further consideration of the movies and propaganda: Adler, Mortimer, *Art and Prudence,* New York: Longmans Green and Company, 1937; Charters, W. W., *Motion Pictures and Youth, A Summary,* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935; Dale, Edgar, *The Content of Motion Pictures,* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935; Holaday, Perry W. and Stoddard, George D., *Getting Ideas from the Movies,* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933; Peterson, Ruth C. and Thurstone, L. L., *Motion Pictures and the Social Attitudes of Children,* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES AND DISCUSSION NOTES

1. Are movie directors responsible for education or for entertainment? Consider the desires, interests, and demands of movie-goers, of producers. Why do people go to the movies? What do they want? Why are moving pictures produced?

2. Who is responsible for the cheap, immature level of many moving pictures? Commercial propagandists, the public itself, or both? It is easy to find fault with the films, but just where must we turn to fix responsibility? Where is the real lever on which we may press for improvement?

3. The same problem affects radio programs. The great and growing popularity of good concert and opera music shows how the public taste can be educated. Many institutions and individuals coöperated in bringing this about, not least the Metropolitan Opera Company, the National Broadcasting Company, wealthy patrons of music, and the public schools in their excellent coöperation with the Damrosch programs. Discuss similar methods for educating the public taste for movies. What can you do in your community?

4. Ask each member of the group to make a list of the films which he liked best and the common qualities, if any, in those films. Compare these lists. Is there, then, much truth in the statement that Hollywood gives to a large audience of average Americans what they seem to want?

5. Do the movies propagate "false ideals"? If so, how can this be avoided? Should we censure the movies? Arouse public opinion against poor movies? Educate the public to see movies more critically? *How* does a group answer these questions?

6. The subtle power of movie propaganda comes from the fact that ideals about happiness, marriage, love, success, etc., are seldom clearly formulated by the actors. They are assumed or taken for granted by the whole story. Thus, we look at the scene, slip into the easy way of accepting what every one accepts. We are one, in sympathy, with the crowd on the stage. And the action moves rapidly. Discuss the effect of this situation on our critical thinking.

7. Discuss some of the assumptions taken for granted by the stories of current films. For instance, is happiness the chief goal of life? Do a fine house and plenty of servants and large automobiles mean greatness? Do sentimental kindness and altruism appear as the marks of a great and good person? How much is the *status quo* questioned for its efficiency, honesty, ethics? Does the gangster who becomes rich feel that he has been successful? Does he experience those "good" things which most people want — happiness, a sense of creation and contribution, prestige, power, the elation of being alive?

Volume I APRIL, 1938 *Number 7*

What's Beneath the Label?

IN our monthly letter for November, 1937, we outlined seven common propaganda devices. Among these are Name Calling and Glittering Generalities. We now analyze in greater detail how these devices affect our beliefs and acts. Our interest in this analysis lies in *penetration below the surface* appearance of things so that a deeper understanding of social events may result.

The saying, "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet," in its proverbial use is a dangerous half-truth. Our reactions to an object, a person, an organization, a practice, or a proposal of any kind are powerfully influenced by the words used to describe them.

Here are illustrations of the effects created by names:

1. A generation ago, a certain kind of "corn syrup" was first marketed under the artificial name of "Karo." Although an edible substance, the essential ingredient in this liquid, *glucose,* looked and sounded too much like *glue* to appeal to most housewives and consumers. This detrimental association was avoided by the use of the new term "Karo" about which could be built fresh meanings helpful in the marketing of the product.

2. Notice the difference between our responses to the *same* man when he is introduced as "Mr. John W. Smith" and when he is presented as "Dr. J. Wallingford Smith." The title and the suggestion of distinction conferred by the latter form give a higher status and power than that conveyed by "Mr. John W. Smith." When he was campaigning for the presidency in 1912, Theodore Roosevelt referred to his opponent as "Professor" Wilson, although Mr. Wilson was then Governor of New Jersey and had been president of Princeton University. Mr. Roosevelt's hope was that his label would create in the voters' minds a picture of an impractical bookish person unfitted for the serious masculine business of being America's Chief Executive. Anti-New Deal cartoons have repeatedly employed the same method against "brain trusters."

3. In New York City the Consolidated Gas Company has recently changed its corporate title to the Consolidated *Edison* Company. Many other electric concerns throughout America have similarly used the inventor's name. Why? Because the public utility industry had fallen into popular disfavor, it may have used this means to rehabilitate itself by a nominal link with an idolized figure in science and invention. An impressive and agreeable label turneth away wrath.

4. Modern defenders of the capitalist or profit system frequently use the phrase, the *enterprise* system. The reason? A vague, friendly "aroma" surrounds the concept of enterprise; it calls up such popularly admired traits as thrift and independence, deeds of courage, exploration, and noble accomplishment. "Company" unions have recently been converted into "independent" unions for essentially the same reason. The recent use of the term "conservator" instead of "receiver" for a closed bank tends to make more palatable the uncomfortable fact of bankruptcy. Similarly the current economic "depression" is called a "recession"; and what is actually "death" insurance is sold as "life" insurance.

5. The great advantages of a verbal pattern which will help rather than hinder one's objectives are demonstrated in the career of Upton Sinclair. For many years he had run as a *Socialist* candidate in California for such offices as Governor and U. S. Senator, but he never received more than 60,000 votes. In 1934 he campaigned as a *Democratic* candidate, and, though defeated, received close to a million votes. Mr. Sinclair's philosophy had not changed, but he recognized that the content of his ideas was more acceptable under one name than under another. In searching for a slogan which would serve as a vote-getter, he coined the phrase "End Poverty in California" and noticed that the initials spelled the word EPIC. The EPIC plan thus became the shorthand way of referring to a program of immediate and partial socialization of industry and agriculture for the direct benefit of the unemployed, who were to produce goods and services for one another and, indirectly, for the benefit of all taxpayers, who would be relieved of their support. This plan doubtless would have been overwhelmingly rejected even by its beneficiaries had it been designated frankly as "experimental socialism," which it was by history and dictionary definition. *Epic* suggests the high adventures of a great crusade, the legendary heroism of some saga, the noble deeds of a famous poem or historical romance, and the enthusiastic visions of a younger and happier world. Almost any conception, effectively linked with such a background, will make headway.

These examples of "labels" illustrate the importance in influencing public opinion of the use of language apart from the actual concepts.

How Labels Influence Attitudes

A simple test can be employed to show how much one's judgment of the desirability of a particular course of action is influenced by the kind of label attached to it. First, give to any group of people selected at random from an American community the following sentences with these instructions: "Draw a ring around the *A* if you *agree* with the sense of the proposition; draw a ring around the *D* if you *disagree* with the statement."

A D 1. We would have much cheaper electric light and power if this industry were owned and operated by various governmental units for the benefit of all the people.

A D 2. No gifted boy or girl should be denied the advantages of higher education just because his parents lack the money to send him to college.

A D 3. The Federal Government should provide to all classes of people opportunity for complete insurance at cost against accident, sickness, premature death, and old age.

A D 4. All banks and insurance companies should be run on a non-profit basis like the schools.

A D 5. Higher income taxes on persons with incomes of more than $10,000 a year should be levied immediately.

A D 6. The only way most people will ever be able to live in modern sanitary homes is for the government to build them on a non-profit basis.

A D 7. Many more industries and parts of industries should be owned and managed coöperatively by representatives of workers, consumers, technicians, and administrators.

The reader should mark the seven items as directed before proceeding further.

In most groups the degree of agreement will be at least 50 per cent.

Now prepare for a jolt. None of these policies is at present generally operative in this country. Every single one of these statements is derived from the Socialist party platforms dating back to the Nineties. Most persons are taken aback by this discovery. It indicates clearly that when propositions are judged on their merit alone, more persons favor them than when the issues are confused by identification with prejudicial stereotypes. Word-reactions rather than detailed appraisals of a philosophy and its ideals are what we commonly encounter. To check this generalization, repeat the test with a similar audience, but *this time tell them in advance* that these propositions were first developed as political planks by socialists and that you wish to find out how "socialistically" inclined they are. Under these circumstances, the percentage of agreement will be much smaller than before. The "mental set" created by past training and environment is chiefly responsible for this difference. A situation such as this shows how necessary it is that education try to provide learners with facts about a problem (including facts concerning their own natures) before an adequate consideration or solution of the problem can be reached.

"Unconscious" Fascism

Recent pyschological research shows that the mental mechanisms operating in the field of social attitudes produce curious results. Not only may Americans be more "socialistic" than they realize, but, paradoxically enough, they may also be more "fascistic" than they realize. To demonstrate this, another test similar in pattern to the one above should be taken. Place a plus sign (+) before a statement if you are disposed to agree with it and a minus sign (–) if you disagree.

1. Labor unions are all right, but we can't have strikes.
2. In order to give American workers more jobs, the United States should stop immigration.
3. A larger navy should be built to give men jobs and to protect our foreign markets.
4. Most people on relief are living in reasonable comfort.
5. Any able-bodied man could get a job right now if he tried hard enough.
6. The unemployed should be given military training so that our country could be protected in time of war.
7. Most labor trouble is caused by radical agitators.

A simple check of the people tested will show that practically all persons who answer these statements affirmatively will reject vigorously the label "Fascist"—they would probably prefer to call themselves "Conservatives," "Republicans," or "Jeffersonian Democrats." As a matter of fact, these ideas are essentially those held by Hitler and the German National Socialists. "Esteemed" practices can exist under a "disliked" label; "despised" practices may hide under an "admired" label. In reaching a decision about any issue, always ask: (1) Have I "discounted" properly the distorting influence of certain names? Do I know what the names actually mean in and out of their context? (2) Have I given due weight to the *observable* con-

sequences in human welfare of specific actions associated with a certain viewpoint?

Measuring "Emotional" Differences of Words

Another way to illustrate the power of labels to influence behavior appears in this experiment. Begin with a series of political party names, some referring to *real,* active, present-day organizations, some of *historical* significance but now encountered only in textbooks, and some wholly *fictitious.* Here is a possible list: Commonwealth, Communist, Conservative, Constitution, Democratic, Farm-Labor, Federalist, Independence, International, Labor, Liberal, Liberty, National Welfare, Patriots, Peoples, Progressive, Prohibition, Radical Reform, Republican, Socialist, Technocratic, Workers. Print each one of these terms on a plain card. Then give the complete set of twenty-two cards with these instructions to the person being "tested:"

On each of the accompanying cards is the name of a single political party. You probably do not feel the same way about each one. *Assuming that the platforms of all these parties were the same, arrange the names on these cards in the order of your liking for them.* Try to answer for yourself the question, "Which name do I like best?" Then ask, "For which name do I care least?" Finally, place all the remaining party names in their proper positions according to your *general liking* for them.

In previous demonstrations of this experiment certain results have occurred regularly. Despite the best efforts of people to react to the pure sight and sound of a name *as such,* they usually find it impossible to do so. Its "associations" — real or imaginary — constantly influence its relative position. When averaged, certain labels like "Democratic" and "Republican" are highly favored by most representative groups in American society; others like "Communist," "Radical Reform," and "Technocratic" are placed near the bottom; and others like "Liberal," "Federalist," "Constitution," and "Commonwealth" occupy a middle position. A central rank is what one would expect for all names if they were equally new and indifferently accepted, and if no special influence making for acceptance or rejection were present.

The history of language shows that many words are constantly losing and acquiring meanings. The word "Christian" made the ancient pagans livid with rage. A "good" term may fall into disfavor and a "bad" term win esteem under changed conditions. The label "Republican" was a term of reproach during the French Revolutionary period (and still is in many European countries), but in most parts of the United States since the Civil War it has represented the height of "respectability." In America the term "Socialist" generally arouses an antagonistic emotion, yet in France the Radical Socialists have long been a major party in governmental affairs; and in Germany the followers of Hitler call themselves the National *Socialist* German Workers Party in order to benefit from the good will which had accrued to that label in the pre-Nazi period. In this country partial socialist conceptions or *actions* have developed and have proved a distinct asset to those who have sponsored them, but the socialist *label* itself as a name has definitely handicapped those who used it in appealing for votes.

Demonstrating the "Halo" Effect

From what we have so far discovered, it is plain that certain terms have what is called a positive or attractive "halo" and others a negative or repelling one. Such "power-words" are the favorites in the vocabulary of propagandists. Neutral terms are rarely used because they lack the exciting quality demanded by those who wish to mold public opinion in accordance with their interests. As we suggested at the beginning of this letter, the names of individuals themselves may possess these same characteristics. The following exercise which may be used by the reader on himself or, better, with small groups should produce additional insight in this area:

Examine this list of eight figures prominent in national and international affairs. For each trait rank these individuals on a scale of 1 to 8 so that the person who, you consider, stands highest in this particular trait receives a *1,* the person lowest an *8.* Example: Run down the column headed "Intellectual Power" and place a *1* next to the name of the person in this list who in your opinion has more of this capacity than the others; place a *2* next to the name of the individual whom you rank second; and so on until each person has received a number, and *8* stands opposite the individual whom you rank lowest in this respect. Do the same for all the other traits indicated. Take special care with the last column, "General Esteem."

Trait / Name	Intellectual Power	Courage	Honesty	Physical Attractiveness	Stability of Character	General Esteem
Earl Browder						
Henry Ford						
Adolf Hitler						
Alfred Landon						
John L. Lewis						
F. D. Roosevelt						
Joseph Stalin						
Norman Thomas						

If this chart is filled in by the reader, examine it and see if some person is consistently high and another regularly low. If a number of people participate, average their rankings and see if a similar tendency is present. Most experiments with this material show that the individual who ranks *1* in any of these qualities rarely falls below a *2* or *3* in any of the others; conversely, the man who gets an *8* in any trait seldom rises above a *4* or *5* in any other. For example, people do not give half their high marks to Hitler and half to Stalin; instead, they bestow them all upon one or the other. Similarly, most people put Roosevelt and Landon ahead of Thomas and Browder on these traits.

The high degree of relationship among these qualities is largely a result of the "halo" or general total impression that has been created about each personality. These differences in "prestige" are important; one must be constantly on one's guard to avoid being misled by them. Here, as always, analysis must be our chief instrument in dealing with the propagandas which surround us. We must ask: What does this particular name mean to me? Why do I respond favorably or unfavorably? To what extent has this response been the result of my own analysis of the name and its meaning? To what extent has it been the result of my being "conditioned" to such response by the opinions of my parents, my school, and neighborhood associates, by sermons, newspaper accounts, radio talks, and newsreel presentations? For example, if I like or dislike Henry Ford or Franklin Roosevelt or Adolf Hitler or Joseph Stalin, am I able to state the actual reasons for my like or dislike?

Suggested Readings

Asch, S. E., Block, Helen, and Hertzman, M. "Studies in the Principles of Judgments and Attitudes," *Journal of Psychology*, V (1938), 219–251.

Hartmann, G. W. "The Contradiction Between the Feeling-Tone of Political Party Names and Public Response to Their Platforms," *Journal of Social Psychology*, VII (1936), 336–357.

Hartmann, G. W. "The Social Attitudes and Information of American Teachers," in *The Teacher and Society*. (First Yearbook of the John Dewey Society for the Study of Education and Culture; W. H. Kilpatrick, editor), New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1937. VIII, 174–230.

Markey, J. F., *The Symbolic Process*. New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1928.

Stagner, Ross. "Fascist Attitudes," *Journal of Social Psychology*, VII (1936), 309–319; 438–454.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES AND DISCUSSION NOTES

1. Can plain facts be made more appealing for the consumer's dollar than fancy packages and pretty pictures? For instance, would you take away the picture on a tin of plums? What facts do you want on a tin of plums? About a suit of clothes? About eggs, milk, vegetables?

2. Make an "Anthology of Indictments," stating as fairly as you can for all the major prevailing social and political conflicts the prejudices of both sides. This "Anthology" will really be a list of labels with meanings, definitions, and illustrations.

3. Discuss what would be the best name and label for a new political party which would combine the political methods of Father Coughlin, the late Senator Huey Long, and Dr. Townsend with the political theories of the Wisconsin Progressives, the North Dakota Non-Partisan League, and the Farmer-Labor Party. Can these be combined? How effective are such slogans as "Share the Wealth," "Social Justice," and "Thirty Dollars Every Thursday"?

4. Words, like labels, carry different meanings to different people. A careful discussion of the following sentence will help illustrate the need for work-

able definitions: "The newspapers of America furnish no driving force for social reform that touches the economic system."

5. Is fear a danger to democracy? Where there is fear is there a real or an imagined danger? What fears do the following labels represent and what are the real and imagined dangers behind them: "economic royalist," "red," "regimentation," "socialized medicine," "racket," "purge"?

Volume I MAY, 1938 *Number 8*

Propaganda Techniques of German Fascism[1]

"WHAT is truly vicious," observed *The New York Times* in an editorial, September 1, 1937, "is not propaganda but a monopoly of it." This monopoly is seen most clearly in totalitarian states where all channels of communication are controlled by the government. The extent to which the propaganda machinery of a country has been brought under the control of one organization or a group of related organizations is a useful measure of the degree to which absolutism dominates it, of the extent to which democracy has been eliminated.

In democratic countries this monopoly aspect of propaganda is held in check by rivalries between competing organizations. Political, economic, educational, and religious spokesmen are able to and actually do disseminate rival propagandas. This gives those at whom the rival propagandas are directed some freedom of choice among the alternatives offered them.

The ability of individuals and organizations in democracies to enter their special viewpoints into the rivalry of propagandas is restricted chiefly by economic considerations.[2] In buying radio time and newspaper space, in the outright purchase of radio stations and newspapers, in securing the expert services of professional propagandists and public relations counselors, individuals and groups with large financial resources have an advantage over those with small resources. Producers of goods, for instance, have greater propaganda power than either consumers or labor.[3]

The power of propaganda increases as its control becomes more centralized, as the trend to monopoly increases. In democratic countries this takes place when competing propagandists resolve their differences and agree upon one propaganda. This maneuver can be seen in amalgamations or agreements within political, economic, educational, and religious groups. As various groups come to collaborate in terms of common interests, their propaganda programs tend to coincide and to increase in power. This process is stimulated by the centralization of the control of the economic structure of a country. A tendency toward a monopoly of wealth is accompanied by a corresponding tendency toward a monopoly of propaganda.

Contrasted with the relative freedom for the dissemination of propaganda in democracies is the complete or nearly complete elimination of this freedom in totalitarian countries. Fascist Germany illustrates how propaganda is used both to bring a dictator into power and to aid him in maintaining that power. In Germany the propaganda which helped convince the people of the efficiency of the National Social-

[1] In the future the Institute hopes to publish letters on the aims and techniques of propaganda in other fascist countries and in the Soviet Union. The reader is referred particularly to the November and December issues of PROPAGANDA ANALYSIS for an elaboration of the method used in these analyses.

[2] See A. M. Lee, "Freedom of the Press: Services of a Catch Phrase," in *Studies in the Science of Society*, G. P. Murdock, editor (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937), pp. 355–75.

[3] See A. M. Lee, *The Daily Newspaper in America* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1937), chapters on "Advertising" (esp. pp. 370–3) and "Labor" (esp. pp. 152–63).

ist[4] solution for the country's political and economic problems was reinforced by an army of storm troops that weakened opposition through terrorism. Such methods made difficult and dangerous the promulgation of competing propagandas. The power of the Nazi propaganda was increased further by the financial support of certain business men and by the political intrigues of Colonel Franz von Papen and other officials of the Weimar Republic.

With the establishment of the National Socialist régime its monopoly of propaganda was rapidly achieved. Suppression of opposition was thorough. Every source of public information and nearly every instrument capable of affecting public opinion came under its control. Although some of the church groups were difficult to dominate, in general the National Socialist propaganda drive went forward with a thoroughness which exceeded that of World War propaganda.[5]

To understand how this monopoly of propaganda was effected, it is necessary to review the conditions under which German Fascism was established.

In Germany, as elsewhere, Fascism is the outcome of economic and political instability. It is an undemocratic means for dealing with the mass unemployment of city workers, the economic distress of the middle classes, the impoverishment of farmers, and the efforts of these groups for economic reforms. So long as democratic realities continue to exist, with freedom of speech, press, and assembly, such efforts for reform can obtain a public hearing, and various programs to relieve and prevent distress stand a chance of enactment into law. Thus, representative democracy provides a means for reconciling conflicts through the expression of opinions and propagandas for different solutions, from which an enlightened public can make its choice. In Germany this means of mitigating the abuses of the economic system was feared by influential politicians, industrialists, financiers, and great landowners. After the worldwide depression of the late 1920's these individuals and groups felt that they could maintain their status only through the abolition of representative democratic government. Their opportunity came in Adolf Hitler, master propagandist.

Had there been no depression and no unemployment in Germany, there doubtless would have been no Nazi party in control of Germany today. But the depression was more than another business crisis. It brought back vividly the hardships of the inflation period, the distress at the end of the war. It caused millions of Germans to lose faith in the ability of the Weimar Republic to prevent such recurring disasters. This major crisis was utilized by Hitler to convince growing numbers of Germans, particularly in the middle classes, that the Republic offered no future, no work, no promise, no hope for themselves or for their children. The social strain created by this condition made possible an audience highly susceptible to the propaganda of demagogues and cliques of demagogues.

Sometimes a demagogue is sincere in his propaganda; usually he is confused. Typically, a demagogic clique is corrupt in whole or in part. The corrupt elements are usually successful in proportion to their astuteness and unscrupulousness. They will agitate for a fee; they will exact for their services all that the traffic will bear; they will serve or pretend to serve many interests. The extent to which Hitler and his Nazi clique were sincere, astute, or unscrupulous may never be fully known. At the critical moment the NSDAP did receive the secret financial backing of a small group of Germans who wanted a government which would abolish freedom of speech, press, and assembly; which would eliminate labor unions; and which would deal effectively with expressed opposition. Such a government was established in Germany in 1933 under the leadership of Adolf Hitler.[6]

[4] The official name of the political party which brought Fascism to Germany is the *Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei* (National Socialist German Workers Party). For brevity's sake it is commonly referred to as the National Socialist party or by its initials, NSDAP. A short abbreviation much used in America is Nazi. As shown later, it is not actually a "socialist" or a "workers" party.

[5] See H. D. Lasswell, *Propaganda Technique in the World War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927).

[6] In spite of, or partly because of, the terrorism which accompanied Nazi propaganda, and because of a slight economic upturn in the autumn of 1932, public opinion began to react against Hitler. This was shown by a sharp decline in votes polled by the National Socialist party in the Reichstag election of November 6, 1932. Because the democratic realities of the Weimar Republic still permitted considerable free play of public opinion, a few of Hitler's most influential supporters decided at this juncture to urge his appointment as Chancellor. See Frederick L. Schuman, *The Nazi Dictatorship* (2nd ed., revised; New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1936), chapter on "Victory by Default," for details of the victory of the National Socialists and of President von Hindenburg's appointment of Hitler as Chancellor on January 30, 1933.

GERMANY'S defeat in the World War and her humiliation in the Treaty of Versailles had become less significant in the reconstruction period of the Weimar Republic; but at the end of the Twenties the world depression struck the German people another crushing blow and brought unemployment and impoverishment to increasing millions. Anger and unrest filled the land. In such a period it was natural in Germany, as anywhere, that a large section of the population should lend a favorable ear to anyone who offered himself as a savior. The Socialists and Communists attributed the depression and its consequences to the inherent weaknesses of a system of production for private profit. This they sought to replace by a system of public ownership. Their program made a rational appeal; as propaganda, however, it was much less effective than the emotionally charged propaganda of the Nazis.

The program and, more particularly, the actions of the National Socialist party have reflected the frustrations and despairs of the German workers, farmers, and middle class. Hitler's life actually epitomized and dramatized the experiences of the German people. Until his final overwhelming political victory, Hitler had known only failure. He wanted to be an artist and failed; an architect, and became a house painter; he went into the war with all possible enthusiasm and returned from it a physical wreck with no hope and no future in the country which had lost. Some excuse, some outlet, had to be found.

The middle class, one of the most politically important sections of the population, had been neglected. After the war this class in particular suffered from Germany's failure, defeat, and humiliation. It suffered from the failure of the Weimar Republic to cope effectively with the economic crisis. It distrusted communism. It feared violent change, but it wanted such change as would give a sense of security. Then came Adolf Hitler, a leader, who promised the people all that they wanted. Most Germans felt that conditions were too bad even to question how all that he offered could be achieved. The few who did raise their voices in protest or doubt were silenced by argument, by force, or by honest conviction that this new scheme, this new hope, must be tried. Everything was promised to every one: socialism to the laborer and to the more liberal *Kleinbürger;* partition of the great estates to the peasant; dissolution of trusts and economic security to the middle class citizen; salvation from communism to the upper bourgeois; and to every one elimination of the Jews, rearmament of the Reich, and "national liberation." This was the appeal of the "National Socialist German Labor Party." A mass following was the result. Power, however, could come only by persuading the industrialists, the financiers, and the feudal military caste to support the Nazi movement. Hitler united them, organized them, and won their support with his promises that they should not fear his labor-winning social program. It was understood that they could retain control behind the scenes if Hitler were left free to manage the political show.

It is difficult to estimate the support or strength of the industrialists. As in most countries many business leaders contributed to all the major parties. Despite its socialism, the growing following of the NSDAP made it a useful tool to crush Marxism, democracy, and the German labor movement. The list of industrialists and aristocratic contributors expanded rapidly between 1925 and 1933, especially after 1930. The most powerful figure[7] was the Ruhr magnate, Chairman Fritz Thyssen of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke A.G. The importance of this financial backing, however, should not be overemphasized. So far as present records show, these men did not determine the policies of the party. Those had been decided before their support was elicited. "Socialism" was a Glittering Generality privately admitted by the party leaders. They had no plan and no intention of changing the existing economic system. Capitalism was all they knew and all they wanted. But once in power, political control dominated economic control. "Capitalism," as free enterprise, became a Glittering Generality. Virgil Jordan,[8] president of the National Industrial Conference Board, Inc., writes:

> . . . The National-Socialist régime has established a rigid system of planned economy. The aim of the

[7] See John T. Flynn, "The Steel Master Behind Hitler's Drive for Power," *The New York World-Telegram,* March 16, 1938 (NEA Service, Inc.). "He [Thyssen] is the man who made Hitler's regime possible and mobilizes big business in Germany behind him now."

[8] *Economic Development of Germany under National Socialism* (New York: National Industrial Conference Board, Inc., 1937), pp. ix–xi.

government is to conduct the operation of the economic system in the interest of general welfare, as the government conceives it. All private interests may be sacrified to the national interest. No difference of opinion is allowed as to what constitutes the national interest. That question is decided by the leader of the National-Socialist Party, Chancellor Adolf Hitler, in consultation with party members and with the representatives of industry and trade. Economic planning was found to be impossible without putting labor and industry in a strait-jacket. The government determines the tasks that private industry must fulfil in order to promote national welfare and, through the exercise of dictatorial political power, it tries to create the conditions under which those tasks can be accomplished. . . .

By fixing wage rates, hours of work, prices, profits, and interest rates; by controlling imports and subsidizing exports; by regulating expansion of plant and equipment, the supply and distribution of raw materials, and new security issues; and by spending billions of marks on public works and rearmament —the National-Socialist régime has been successful in providing the available working force of the country with regular employment at a rate of wages sufficient to provide the basic necessities of life, but which does not permit an appreciable increase in the standard of living. . . . Once the government embarked on the program of rearmament and economic self-sufficiency, the freedom of enterprise had to be sacrificed.[9]

To win their way to power the National Socialists used all the techniques of propaganda, all the avenues for its dissemination which modern science and invention have made possible, and all the old appeals and shibboleths. Professor Schuman[10] gives a vivid picture of one of the thousands of carefully planned great mass meetings: the waiting, the expectancy, the late hour when people's resistance is low, the decorations, the company of storm troopers drilling, the dramatic torchlight parade, the bands, the singing, finally the hush, a crash of drums and trumpets, the slow solemn entrance of a well disciplined procession to stirring martial music or perhaps Richard Wagner's "Entry of the God's into Valhalla"; at the end a special bodyguard, the uniformed party leaders, and then, "the centre of all eyes, Der Führer—in his tan raincoat, hatless, smiling, and affably greeting those to right and left. A man of the people! Germany's Savior!" "Heil! Heil!" and the third "HEIL!" swells into a great ovation. Speeches, spotlights, cheers, waving of arms. The audience responds at the end with an overwhelming chorus, "Heil! Heil! Heil! Hitler!" The bands blare forth, and the multitude chants the "Horst Wessel Lied."

Vernon McKenzie,[11] director of the School of Journalism of the University of Washington, reports such a meeting in September, 1932, when he sat on the platform within ten feet of the Führer:

> A Canadian friend who has heard Hitler speak many times expresses succinctly the power of the Leader's eloquence or demagogy, whatever you may call it.
>
> "I could listen to Hitler talk for an hour on one side of a subject," he says, "and then if he turned around and for the next hour directly contradicted everything he had previously said, I would follow him and believe him. That is what I think of Hitler's persuasive powers! If he can get me that way, how much more can he get the German audiences?"
>
> This evening Hitler . . . swayed that audience as I have never seen any audience swayed before or since. He did not mention Hindenburg by name, but one of his perorations went something like this:
>
> "Certain parties are contending for the right to guide the destinies of the German people. Certain leaders . . . one of them is eighty-six; the other is forty-three. Which do you think is likely to survive to guide the destinies of our race?"
>
> . . . He could play with that audience just as he wished. Looking down at the sea of faces from the platform, the 30,000 in the auditorium seemed to be subjects of mass hypnotism.

The evidence of Mr. McKenzie's Canadian friend is borne out by comments of American newspaper correspondents who point out that Hitler's addresses are often unintelligible. Large numbers of his listeners apparently listen with their emotions. When their tension becomes high, they intercept the speech by emotional outbursts at seemingly inappropriate times. Here we see the force of language with or without meaning as a molder of public opinion. Only intelligent citizens skilled in analysis of propaganda and immunized against the wiles of the orator were unaffected by Hitler. Among such doubtless were editors, writers, teachers, clergymen, and others who later were to be killed, imprisoned, or forced to acquiesce in silence to a régime they disapproved.

Hitler, the master propagandist, knew that

[9] See also the articles by Otto D. Tolischus, Berlin correspondent of *The New York Times*, for September 2–7, 1937.

[10] *Op. cit.*, pp. 91 ff.

[11] *Through Turbulent Years* (New York: Robert M. McBride and Company, 1938), pp. 37–8.

propaganda, to be effective, must be keyed to the desires, hopes, hatreds, loves, fears, and prejudices of the people; he knew that most human beings crave a scapegoat to take the blame of disaster and to bolster their own pride. The Jews were made the scapegoat. He blamed them not only for the existing unemployment and impoverishment but also for the loss of the war and the Treaty of Versailles. But the anti-Jewish propaganda had even greater value to Nazism than the mere creation of a scapegoat. Through the Jews Hitler was able to strike at anyone, Jew or non-Jew, opposed to Nazism, and to discredit any plan which aimed at the peaceful rehabilitation of Germany. Hitler's objective was to create in the minds of Germans an ugly image of "Jew." The word "Jew" was deliberately made synonymous with everything the Germans resented and hated or could be led to resent and hate. Once that was done, Nazi agitators revived or manufactured for circulation notorious forgeries, which branded all those persons as Jews who did or said anything not in accord with Nazi ideas. To attack the Dawes Plan, for example, it became necessary to label Dawes as a Jew and so, according to *Der Stürmer,* Dawes was portrayed to its readers as a full-blooded Jew, originally named Davidson. The banking house of J. P. Morgan, which acted as a house of issue for a German government loan opposed by Hitler, was promptly branded a Jewish banking house and the Morgan name given as an abridgment of the more Jewish-sounding Morganstern. Similarly the entire French nation, whom the Nazis consider to be Germany's natural enemy, was described as a nation of Jews.

The Germans, Hitler said, were the world's greatest race, supreme in the arts of peace and unconquerable in war unless betrayed by the Jews. Thus, he was able to give to the National Socialist program the driving power of strong nationalism, coupled with the emotional appeal of racial superiority, intensified by hatred of the despised Jews. At the same time he inveighed against the great bankers, industrialists, and landowners as vigorously as did the Communists and Socialists. He proclaimed himself the savior of the farmers, the small business men, and the workers. As early as 1920 Hitler's newly created National Socialist party made promises identical with those of the Socialists and Communists. The NSDAP platform adopted in Munich, February 24, 1920, included these demands: abolition of unearned incomes, nationalization of all trusts, abolition of interest on land loans, the enactment of a law for confiscation without compensation of land for public purposes. In May, 1926, the party decided that this program was never to be changed. Two years later, April, 1928, Adolf Hitler signed a statement which in effect held invalid the phrase "confiscation without compensation." Since the National Socialists hold to the view of private property, he claimed, it was "self-evident" that this phrase referred "only to the creation of legal means whereby land which was acquired in illegal ways or which is not being administered to the best interests of the nation's welfare might be expropriated if necessary. This is directed primarily against Jewish land-speculation companies."[12] The official name of the party is a perfect example of the Glittering Generalities device—*Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei* (National Socialist German Workers Party). In Germany the great pre-Nazi program of public housing and public works and the higher living standards achieved through labor unions had given the word "socialist" favorable connotations. Hitler took full advantage of these connotations, though later his actual program drove socialists into concentration camps and abolished labor unions.

But spellbinding, emotional meetings were not the only Nazi techniques of propaganda which helped bring the party to power. With its mysterious swastika, its parades, its officers, its "Third Reich," its esoteric "wisdom," its solidarity achieved by familiar symbols and uniforms, the party was and is actually a secret society. It is elaborately organized with a women's auxiliary, children's groups, youth divisions—a place for every one. Subtle suggestions run the gamut of emotions: prestige, love, fear, security, pride, hate. Hitler himself is said to have invented the *Hakenkreuz* flag and much of the elaborate military insignia of the brown-uniformed *Sturm-Abteilung,* or storm troops organized on strictly military lines to combat other parties, and of the black-uniformed *Schutzstaffel,* originally the personal bodyguard of Hitler, now a small army of full-time, well paid mercenaries.

Promises, circuses, societies, banners, slogans, hate, fear, hope, pride — all swept the unsatis-

[12] Quoted by Henri Lichtenberger, *The Third Reich* (New York: The Greystone Press, 1937), p. 302.

fied, discouraged Germans into the crowd on the band wagon behind the swastika. Since the advent of the National Socialists the power of the agencies of propaganda has been intensified and coördinated so that all avenues of communication – press, school, radio, motion picture, and even the church – must carry but one propaganda to the public mind, must express one will, one voice, one opinion. Hence the Hitler régime has, in common with other fascist countries, established a system wherein authority flows from the top down; and from the people comes blind, instant, unquestioning obedience. In the pages that follow, the propaganda which aided the National Socialists in winning support, which helps them keep the support of a majority of the people today, is analyzed under the seven common propaganda devices suggested in the November letter of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis.

Name Calling

"Name Calling" is a device to make us form a judgment without examining the evidence on which it should be based. Here the propagandist appeals to our hate and fear.

In as much as the first task of the National Socialists was to destroy simultaneously all trade unions as well as all liberal democratic institutions, it was necessary to make the people believe that these were devilish inventions, cleverly designed by malicious persons to ruin the German people. This they sought to accomplish by asserting with endless repetition that these institutions were similar in structure and mood to those of communism. They then painted communism in terms so lurid as to horrify even the skeptical. With people convinced that communism (often used by the Nazis as synonymous with the Weimar Republic) had been forced on them by a "degenerate" and "malicious" cabal of "alien enemies" to create their misery, they could then rally all good Germans around the Führer, who promised to protect his people by waging relentless war on these "enemies of Germany." This picture was widely accepted and was supported by a complete mythology in which the Jews, communism, and liberalism or democracy were held to be the major evil influences from which the National Socialists saved Germany.

Prominent in this campaign is Julius Streicher's newspaper *Der Stürmer,* which, in addition to its regular anti-Semitism, has recently published *A Story Book for Young and Old Alike,* in which Jews are pilloried and "Aryan" Germans warned against them. The seventeen "folk tales" are illustrated by grotesque caricatures of alleged Semitic types with the title "A Poisonous Mushroom."[13] Koppel S. Pinson,[14] editor of the American edition of Professor Lichtenberger's *The Third Reich,* quotes from the *Berliner Tageblatt's* account of a speech by Dr. Goebbels, Minister of People's Enlightenment and Propaganda, on Templehof Field in Berlin, June 30, 1935:

"Does one believe that we have buttons instead of eyes not to see how certain counter movements in the capital city are once again attempting to spread out? (Applause) And how the bourgeois intellectuals once again are ready to give them brotherly aid with that stupid and inane phrase that the Jew is also a human being. True he is, but what kind of a human being! A flea is also an animal, yet not a very pleasing animal. We do not want the Jew any more! He has no place any longer in the German community!"

"Liberals" are classified as weak, insipid, vacillating, temporizing, and unprincipled. To be a "liberal" or to believe in the "stupid doctrine of equality" fostered by "Jewish-invented democracy" is to be a lily-livered "red." "Jewish democracy" is opposed to the "true democracy," which Hitler claims to have established.

Nazi propagandists supercharge words with feeling and emotion in order to give them greater force in Name Calling. The same supercharging is applied to the "virtue words" which they employ in the Glittering Generalities device. Many of these words derive their virtue from the immense reservoir of honesty, decency, good workmanship, good will, fine imagery, and rich emotionalism of the German people. Others are given significant new meanings.

Glittering Generalities

"Glittering Generalities" is a device by which the propagandist identifies his program with virtue by use of "virtue words." Here he appeals to our emotions of love, generosity, and brotherhood.

Much that is to the interest of those who control the régime is praised in terms of the "community good" and "comradeliness." To the same end there is considerable talk about sub-

[13] *New York Herald Tribune,* April 4, 1938.
[14] Lichtenberger, *op. cit.,* p. 153.

jecting all "narrow" and "selfish" interests to the "welfare of the community." Such words as "labor" and "sacrifice" are given additional "virtue" by ceremonials and dramatic awards.[15] As was previously indicated, the virtue that the word "socialist" had come to connote in Germany was the reason for its inclusion in the official name of the National Socialist party. Many Germans who believed in socialism were thus led to vote for a party whose leadership was committed to destroy socialism.

The most sweeping generality is that conveyed by the word *Volk* (folk or people). The *Volk,* after purging itself of Jewish blood, is to return to the true Germanic tradition of the Middle Ages. To lend authority to this theory a "biological mythology" has had to be invented, and is now proclaimed by professors appointed to university chairs for that purpose. Thus, we see the Card Stacking and Testimonial devices used to strengthen an application of the Glittering Generalities device. The régime utilizes the word "science" to sanction practices, policies, beliefs, and races which it wants approved. By "science" it obtains approval for the destruction of all opposition and of all "Marxist liberal culture."

Other generalities are effective in appealing to special groups. The farmers have been heartened to endure the poor return from their toil by a whole magnificat, written on the theme of *Blut und Boden* (blood and soil). They are told that they are of the "glorious peasant state," and each householder is given the honored title of *Bauer.* (The translation of this word, "peasant" or "farmer," does not convey the same connotation which the original does to National Socialist Germany where the meaning is more that of a "creative builder.") The title is secured to the *Bauer* if he can prove freedom from Jewish blood after January 1, 1800. "*Bauer* honor" ties him to the land and prevents him from changing his occupation or residence. By way of compensation he has the "honor" of having his name placed on an "Estate Roll," which entitles him to use special insignia – something like a coat of arms.

The flattery, the insignia, and the verbal consolations offered to workers on the land have their parallels in those offered to industrial laborers. Nazi propagandists praise the "dignity of labor" and organize festivals in its honor. Labor, they assert, is filled with a new spirit; and to guard this spirit is the task, or mission, of *Die Treuhänder der Arbeit* (the trustees of labor). These "trustees" are government officials in the organizations controlled by the National Socialist party. It is their duty to see that labor disputes do not arise, or, having arisen, are settled as totalitarian expediency may determine.

Particularly important in any totalitarian state is the *Gleichschaltung* or coördination of all the activities of the people. The German Labor Front, administered from the Central Office in Berlin by Dr. Robert Ley, staff leader of the political organization of the party, has fourteen sections. These, according to the National Industrial Conference Board,[16] "deal with practically every aspect of economic and social life of German labor." The Department of *Kraft durch Freude* or "Strength through Joy"[17] is designed to employ all of the laborer's leisure activities and to see that in these his "spirit" is coördinated with the "common" good. This makes it possible to check the way he spends his leisure hours and to prevent his developing and expressing opposition to the régime.

As pointed out above, by using such Glittering Generalities as "national honor" and "public interest" the National Socialists sought to justify the *Gleichschaltung* of industry described thus by the National Industrial Conference Board:[18]

> . . . The state can dismiss the owner of an enterprise from the position of leadership, if his behavior offends against social honor. For the same reason, it can deprive an employee of the position which he occupies. The state can prohibit investment of capital in certain industries if their growth is not desirable and if capital is more urgently needed in some other branch of the national economy. The state can determine the amount of profits that can be paid out and control the employment of the amount retained as surplus. The state determines the amount of raw materials placed at the disposal of the various industries and individual enterprises.

[15] This is one of the many examples of how two or more of the common propaganda devices can be used in combination. Here the Glittering Generalities device is combined with the Band Wagon and Transfer devices.

[16] *Op. cit.,* p. 20.

[17] See Robert A. Brady, *The Spirit and Structure of German Fascism* (New York: The Viking Press, 1937), pp. 149–157.

[18] *Op. cit.,* p. 32. See also Calvin B. Hoover, *Dictators and Democracies* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1937), Essay on "Dictatorship and Property."

In the final analysis, the state fixes prices, wages, rates of interest, and the volume and distribution of credit.

Glittering Generalities are given additional power through the deliberate exploitation and perversion of humane feelings and impulses. This technique, much used by the warring nations in the World War, has made it possible for German Fascists to make the German people serve ends which, in the absence of force or fraud, would not have been respected or tolerated. Examples of such perversion utilize the Transfer device.

Transfer

"Transfer" is a device by which the propagandist carries over the authority, sanction, and prestige of something we respect and revere to something he would have us accept.

Something approaching deification of Chancellor Hitler is an outstanding example of this device. Nazi propagandists seek to establish him as a quasi-divinity and to transfer to him the religious feelings of the German people; then to transfer from him the "divine" sanction of the policies, practices, beliefs, and hatreds which he espouses. Some party spokesmen and supporters refer to Hitler in terms like those applied to Christ. However, the pressure exerted to force the acceptance of the Führer as a modern savior has been resisted by those church leaders who have recognized in the Nazi movement a conflict with Christianity, a conflict admitted by the more outspoken National Socialists. Despite this opposition Nazi leaders have had great success in capturing religious feeling and in establishing Hitler as a divinity embodying the traditions of the old German folklore. The Evangelical Church Letter[19] submitted to Chancellor Hitler in June, 1936, makes these observations:

In this connection we must make known to the Führer and Chancellor our uneasiness over the fact that he is often revered in form that is due to God alone. It is only a few years ago that the Führer himself disapproved of his picture being placed on Evangelical altars. His judgment is taken to be the standard unrestrainedly today not only in political decisions, but also in regard to morality and justice in our people, and he himself is vested with the dignity of the national priest, and even of the mediator between God and the people.

(N.B.: Dr. Goebbels on April 19, 1936: "When the Führer addressed his last appeal to the people on March 28, it was as if a profound agitation went through the whole nation; one felt that Germany was transformed into one single House of God, in which its intercessor stood before the throne of the Almighty to bear witness. . . . It seemed to us that this cry to heaven of a people for freedom and peace could not die away unheard. That was religion in its profoundest and most mystical sense. A nation then acknowledged God through its spokesman, and laid its destiny and its life with full confidence in His hand." See also Göring's speeches.)

Pope Pius XI[20] in his encyclical on Germany, March, 14, 1937, stressed the same point when he wrote:

Beware, Venerable Brethren, of the growing abuse in speech and writing, of using the thrice holy name of God as a meaningless label for a more or less capricious form of human search and longing.

When members of the Roman Catholic Church and of the Protestant churches are not sufficiently influenced by the attempt to transfer their allegiance from the church beliefs which they have held to the beliefs "coördinated" with those of the state, more direct means of persuasion are used. Of these the Pope[21] wrote:

. . . Among the spokesmen there are many who, by reason of their official position, seek to create the impression that leaving the Church, and the disloyalty to Christ the King which it entails, is a particularly convincing and meritorious form of profession of loyalty to the present State. With cloaked and with manifest methods of coercion, by intimidation, by holding out the prospect of economic, professional, civic and other advantages, the loyalty of Catholics and especially of certain classes of Catholic officials to their faith is put under a pressure that is as unlawful as it is unworthy of human beings. All Our fatherly sympathy and deepest condolence We offer to those who pay so high a price for their fidelity to Christ and the Church.

Baldur von Schirach, Nazi youth leader, wrote for the youth of Germany this prayer:[22]

"Adolf Hitler, we believe in Thee. Without Thee we would be alone. Through Thee we are a people. Thou hast given us the great experience of our youth, comradeship. Thou hast laid upon us the task, the duty, and the responsibility. Thou hast given us Thy Name [Hitler Jugend], the most beloved Name that Germany has ever possessed. We speak it with reverence, we bear it with faith and

[19] *International Conciliation,* (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, No. 324), November, 1936, p. 567.
[20] Reprinted in Lichtenberger, *op. cit.,* p. 348.
[21] *Ibid.,* p. 353.
[22] Brady, *op. cit.,* pp. 196–7.

loyalty. Thou canst depend upon us, Adolf Hitler, Leader and Standard-Bearer. The Youth is Thy Name. Thy Name is the Youth. Thou and the young millions can never be sundered."

Effective in transferring the sanction of the Almighty to his program are Hitler's public prayers. For example, in his address to the Reichstag, February 20, 1938,[23] in which the Nazi aggression against Austria, Czechoslovakia and other nations was forecast, Hitler used this device to give his acts divine approval in advance. He closed that address with these words:

> At this hour I should only like to pray the Lord God also in years to come to bestow his blessing upon our work, our acts, our insight and our resolution to preserve us from overbearing as well as cowardly subservience, guiding us on the right path which His providence mapped out for the German people and that He always will give us the courage to do what is right and never waver or shrink before any violence or any danger. Long live Germany and the German nation.

That the attempt to give divine sanction to Hitler and the Nazis has been successful is attested by a petition presented to the Chancellor by the chaplains of the armed forces in the autumn of 1937.[24] From it these excerpts are taken:

> . . . The one half believes enthusiastically everything that is officially announced; the other half holds that it is all a lie. . . . The repeated promises that the rights of the church would be recognized and that full liberty would be given to it to regulate its own affairs have not been forgotten. . . . The State and the party combat today not only the churches, let alone merely political activities of the churches. They combat Christianity. This fact is repeatedly denied. It is true nevertheless. . . . In the training camps of the party it is repeatedly explained that National Socialism has three enemies: Judaism, Masonry and Christianity. Public acceptance of Christianity is regarded, when a new position is to be filled, as a tie that unfits the candidate for service to the State or the party. . . . Of the 18,000 Protestant pastors in Germany approximately 1,300 have been in prison or under police arrest since 1934. That the pastor should be arrested has become a routine affair for Protestant parishes. . . . The type of men who have become famous by combating Christianity and who employ all their power to defile other men's holy things will display when matters become really serious their moral worthlessness. A keen observer can already see the signs. Bolshevism will easily find followers among some of those who today shout "Heil Hitler!"

The prestige and authority of God are used to sanction the National Socialist party, its foreign policy of military expansion,[25] and its domestic policy of bending to its will labor, agriculture, business, and all ideals, including those of Christianity.

Attempts are made to divert the attention of the industrial worker from the declining purchasing power of his labor and from the facts of his exploitation by transferring the feelings aroused in his breast by songs, processions, and rituals to a sense of pride in the "dignity of labor."[26] The prestige, sanction, and authority of previous traditions of labor solidarity are transferred to the politically controlled labor organizations of the National Socialists, who have taken over the ritual and symbolism built up by the pre-Nazi labor unions and by the Social Democrats. May Day has been made the "Day of National Labor." All the "virtue" of the German *Volk* is transferred to labor. Workers are "honored" and "ennobled" with the "spiritual values" of the German *Volk*. This virtue is symbolized by the swastika, which here is the "symbol of German creative power."[27]

Love of the home and motherhood are similarly exploited to encourage women to accept the form of living which the National Socialist program requires of them. Children are made responsive to military ideals by transferring to these ideals the child's love of adventure. The peasant's love of the land is stimulated and transferred to an acceptance of his place in the present régime by such pronouncements as this:[28]

> . . . The peasant, sticking to his soil, tilling all the time, knows what it means to own the ground. There is a higher value besides the one registered in the Hall of Records. Men of the big cities, the

[23] *The New York Herald Tribune*, February 21, 1938.

[24] *The New York Times*, November 28, 1937.

[25] Note Hitler's reference in his speech at Linz, Upper Austria (*The New York Times*, March 13, 1938), to the taking of Austria as a "divine commission" and this quotation from his Vienna speech (*ibid.* April 10, 1938): "I believe it was God's will to send this Austrian boy to the Reich and to permit him to return as a mature man to reunite the two great sections of the German people.

"Within three days the Lord struck the former rulers of this country. Everything that has happened must have been pre-ordained by Divine Will."

[26] Albert Förster, in *Kalender der deutschen Arbeit* (Berlin: Verlag der deutschen Arbeitsfront, 1934), p. 195.

[27] Rolf Dreves, in *Kalender, op. cit.*, p. 57.

[28] Kurt Biging, in *Kalender, op. cit.*, p. 138.

heaps of stones, of the fountain pen, of the ledger, of the sewing needle . . . do not know any more what Mother Earth should mean to them.

For children the Transfer device most frequently employed is the symbol of the Nazi hero – especially in his rôle of soldier. Manliness is identified with the glory of the party and is used as a means of encouraging in German boys an attitude of superiority toward women, and a belief in the doctrines of militarism and anti-Semitism. Words and symbols appertaining to war have been endowed with a glorious sense to make war appear heroic and thrilling. Little children know and give the Hitler salute. Toy soldiers, tanks, machine guns, and simplified battle instructions abound everywhere – symbols to transfer sanction to the later use of real tanks and machine guns. During special "children's evenings" boys and girls read books like *Horst Wants to Be a Soldier, A Child Goes to War, The Battle of Tannenberg,* and *Two Lads in the Navy.*[29] Problems in some arithmetic books deal with such questions as the quantity of gas bombs that would be necessary, if dropped from an altitude of ten thousand feet, to destroy a town of five thousand inhabitants.

Testimonial

The "Testimonial" is a device to make us accept anything from a patent medicine or a cigarette to a program of national policy.

From the fact that "the Führer knows the goal and knows the direction," it follows that his is the supreme testimonial. No authority and no judgment which does not follow from or accord with his can be right. No specialist knows better than he, no recommendation can be better than his. He can deny even the authority of science. Only the conclusions of "German science" as approved by the Führer may be accepted. When the conclusions of science do not accord with his wishes, as in genetics, a new science has to be invented (Card Stacking); its prestige then has to be established by his testimonial.[30] So also with the arts. Only that art which is approved by the Führer and his subordinates as German art may be accepted by the German people.[31] So also does he decree how men and women shall live their lives. The kind of life which has the Führer's approval is that which is surrendered to the state. In this Hitler is the arbiter; his aproval is the supreme testimonial.

By the same leadership principle the attempted deification of Hitler is used to justify all actions at the top of the National Socialist pyramid. Delegation of power down through the party hierarchy is made to justify the actions of every "leader." There are no elections in the democratic sense of the word and no free discussions. "Leaders" hold office indefinitely and at the discretion of their immediate superiors.

Plain Folks

"Plain Folks" is a device used by politicians, labor leaders, business men, and even by ministers and educators to win our confidence by appearing to be people like ourselves – "just plain folks among the neighbors."

At the same time that the Führer is canonized, an attempt is made to transform him into a "man of the people." In this, the propagandists are greatly assisted by his habits; for he affects ordinary clothes, wears no medals other than his simple Iron Cross, eats plain food and that sparingly, and leads a quiet, secluded life. He is pictured as a man of the people meeting plain folks in their ordinary walks of life, enjoying with them their simple work and pleasures. But as previously indicated, Hitler wields an almost hypnotic power over an audience as he rushes excitedly through a speech. The simplest peasant and the most untutored servant girl feel that he is talking directly to them. As he speaks, they seem to relive with him his terrible war experiences and his poverty-stricken post-war days. Just as one of the most powerful appeals of the figure of Christ for the poor of all ages is his lowly origin and his expressions of sympathy for humble people, so the National Socialists attempt to capitalize on Hitler's early career. Jesus, a carpenter, is the Messiah of the Christian world; Hitler, a house painter, is the savior of Germany. However, to judge by what Hitler has written in his book, *Mein Kampf,* he appears to have little sympathy but much

[29] cf. Ralph Thurston, "Under the Nazi Christmas Tree," *The New Republic,* December 25, 1935, pp. 193–4. See also Schuman, *op. cit.,* pp. 370–374.

[30] See Brady, *op. cit.,* "The New Nazi Sciences," pp. 46–52.

[31] See Olin Downes in *The New York Times,* April 3, 1938. " . . . It remains a fact that an absolute dictatorship of the sort now practiced in such extensive areas of the world overseas [Germany, Italy, and Russia] is nothing but destructive to creative thought in any field."

contempt for the broad masses. Miriam Beard[32] says:

> . . . He [Hitler] will not be squeamish about his methods: "Whenever people fight for their existence all questions of humanity or esthetics fall away to nothing." Mercy is a vain illusion, he informs us on page 267 of the original, cut from the translation, "in a world . . . in which Force is forever mistress over the weak" and in which "Nature does not know" it.
>
> The real sting is taken from his [Hitler's] remarks on labor. His intention to "free economic life from the influences of the mass" is omitted.

In this case, as in that of the other propaganda devices discussed in this paper, the element of misrepresentation of fact is considerable, although it is not always predominant. The device which plays the most important part in National Socialist propaganda is, therefore, "stacking the cards" for or against beliefs or facts which the National Socialists wish either to encourage or to suppress.

Card Stacking

"Card Stacking" is a device in which the propagandist employs all the arts of deception to win our support for himself, his group, nation, race, policy, practice, belief, or ideal. He stacks the cards against the truth. He uses under-emphasis and over-emphasis to dodge issues and evade facts.

The misrepresentation of facts works in two ways. On the one hand there is a rigorously enforced censorship, backed by an elaborate spy system and the constant threat of concentration camps. By this means the régime can suppress facts, prevent discussion and expression of discontent and opposition. This largely accounts for the fact that many visitors on returning from Germany report that they heard no expression of discontent. On the other hand the régime has freedom to give publicity to falsehoods. Hitler[33] approves such publicity in *Mein Kampf* (deleted from the English translation) when he writes:

> . . . "Propaganda . . . does not have to seek objectively for the truth so far as it favors an opponent . . . but exclusively has to serve our interests." It must adopt every device of slander that ingenuity can suggest: "whenever our propaganda permits for a single moment the shimmer of an appearance of right on the other side, it has laid a foundation for doubt in the right of our cause . . . especially among a people that so suffers from objectivity-mania as the German!"

The Reichstag fire[34] on February 27, 1933, one week before the last free election in the Weimar Republic, affords an example of effective Card Stacking. The records of the trial following the fire establish clearly that the firing was planned and executed with finesse, that Communists were immediately accused of the act, that preparations had been made for the arrest of Communists before the fire-calls had been sounded, and that the evidence submitted by the National Socialists against the accused Communists did not stand in court. But none of the significant facts behind the fire was submitted, although foreign observers were convinced that both the National Socialists and the court knew what they were. The falsity of the charge that the Communists burned the Reichstag buildings was never told the German people.

Similar Card Stacking techniques were utilized at the Olympic Games in Berlin and at the fifth centenary anniversary of Heidelberg University. In connection with the latter the celebrations were taken out of the hands of the regular university authorities. The foreign scholars who attended witnessed a series of National Socialist political speeches, storm troop parades, and demonstrations intended to show the German people that the scientific and educational world approved of the Nazi system. Nothing was said of the fact that the leading universities of the world, including three of the oldest — Paris, Oxford, and Cambridge — declined to attend. Nor was any publicity given to the letters sent by these universities, in which they declined the invitations and deplored the loss of academic freedom in the country which gave *Lehrfreiheit* to the world.

The spirit of the Reichstag trial and the Heidelberg celebration is reflected in the announcements of foreign policy from Wilhelmstrasse. Treaties and pronouncements are often regarded as instruments useful to placate, appease, or even deceive other governments. After categorical denials of German interference in

---

[32] "Hitler Unexpurgated: Deletions from 'Mein Kampf,'" in *Nazism: An Assault on Civilization*, Pierre van Paassen, editor (New York: Harrison Smith and Robert Haas, 1934), pp. 268, 272.

[33] Quoted by Beard, *op. cit.*, p. 269.

[34] See Schuman, *op. cit.*, "The Sign from Heaven," pp. 201–212.

Spain, official recognition was given Franco, and Hitler made the statement that German troops were in Spain not only to "protect" her from "communism" but also to keep open for Germany access to ores and other raw materials.

In line with this policy is the destruction of books and papers which contain what the Japanese call "dangerous thoughts." Public and private libraries, book stores, offices, and reference files are searched for "red," "communist," "Jewish" literature – literature which includes the works of Helen Keller, Émile Zola, Marcel Proust, H. G. Wells, Thomas and Heinrich Mann, Arnold Zweig, Albert Einstein, Jacob Wassermann, along with Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. Such books feed great fires in public squares throughout the country. Quotations from some of these works are taken out of their context and presented to the public as examples of how these authors have been "poisoning the community" with "filth" and "lies."

Even long accepted classics are not immune. In a letter[35] to the *Neue Tagebuch* (Prague, Czechoslovakia, April 24, 1937) Dr. Emil Ludwig recounted his abortive attempt to purchase a copy of the only complete edition of *Goethe's Conversations* edited by Baron von Biedermann. The reply which his Zurich bookstore received from Leipzig read, "Biedermann Gespräche mit Goethe destroyed." When he learned that the Third Reich was preparing a new and purged "Selection" of this famous German classic, Dr. Ludwig wrote: "Here are a few examples why *Goethe's Conversations* need to be purged for use in present-day Germany.

"They are Prussians, my friend, so beware! Prussians always claim to know everything better than anyone else."—To Grüner, 1822.

"Patriotism depraves history. Jews, Greeks, and Romans depraved their own history and the history of other peoples by not telling it impartially. The Germans do it, too, with their own history and that of other nations."—To Riemer, 1817.

"He was infuriated by Wurm's efforts to make the Jews an object of ridicule on the stage, and he said, 'It is despicable to pillory a nation which possesses such remarkable talents in art and science. As long as I am in charge of the theatre, this type of play will never be produced.' " – Biedermann Edition, Vol. II, p. 385.

Miriam Beard[36] has shown how the English edition of *Mein Kampf* was purged of remarks which might offend foreigners. Eliminated are the more vitriolic attacks on France and democratic institutions, many of the eulogies of the Germans as a "master race," the more scurrilous references to Jews and to the "stupid masses," and the more blatant advocacy of militarism, force, violence, and war. Hitler says, for example, in words deleted from the translation,[37] that he adopted Feder's anti-usury cry for its drawing power, with no intention of keeping his promise, since a great politician "has to bother himself less with means than with the goal."

An analysis of parallel news reports in German and foreign papers offers examples of the effective use of Card Stacking by a controlled press. For instance, during the trial of Pastor Niemoeller the only news carried by the German papers was a brief attack upon him as one who advocated a policy of love to Jews and traitors and preached from the Old Testament. His release by the court was announced but his rearrest by the secret police was not. Convictions of Roman Catholics for "immoral practices" were published; acquittals were "played down." Although the Minister for Church Affairs, Herr Hans Kerrl, announced that more than 8,000 Catholic religious leaders were or had been under arrest, he did not publish the fact that only about forty-nine had been convicted of immoral actions. Similarly, many crimes of individual Jews are publicized, but no publicity is given to ways in which German Jews have served their country. No intimation, for example, is made of the fact that 12,000 Jews died for Germany in the World War; or that, despite official discouragement, approximately the same proportion of Jews as of Gentiles served in the German army and navy.[38]

In addition to influencing the German people in the direction desired by the dictator, the falsehoods inherent in Card Stacking arouse hatreds which have the effect of rallying the people against the supposed enemy or peril.

[35] Translated by Marvin Lowenthal in a letter to *The New York Times*, July 12, 1937.

[36] *Op. cit.*, pp. 257–279.

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 268.

[38] For a summary of statistics relating to the number and positions of Jews in Germany, see Schuman, *op. cit.*, pp. 316–8; and Mildred Wertheimer, "The Jews in the Third Reich," *Foreign Policy Association Reports*, IX (1933), pp. 174–184. According to German census figures in 1925, professing Judaists constituted 0.9 per cent of the total population of 62,410,619.

Band Wagon

The "Band Wagon" is a device to make us follow the crowd, to accept the propagandist's program *en masse*. Here his theme is: "Everybody's doing it." His techniques range from those of medicine show to dramatic spectacle.

One of the great unifying principles adopted by the National Socialists is that of hate. Among the passages deleted from the English version of *Mein Kampf*, Hitler has written:[39]

. . . "Hate is more lasting than dislike, and the thrusting power for the mightiest upheavals on this earth has at all times come less from scientific recognition than from a fanaticism that fills the souls of the masses and in a forward-driving hysteria" *(vorwärtsjagenden Hysterie)*.

In accordance with this principle Jews, communists, liberals, and democrats, became objects of hatred and scapegoats which could be made to suffer for the people's distress. Unity is further encouraged by patriotic demonstrations. Typical in these are gigantic crowds of people, massed ranks of uniformed troops, bands playing patriotic and martial airs, voices declaiming from a hundred mechanical mouths, ecstatic marchers carrying flickering torches, their resinous smoke blending into the darkness, flags and swastikas everywhere. This is the National Socialist equivalent of "bread and circuses." To bring all Germans upon the National Socialist band wagon, the party propagandists play continuously upon the common fears, hatreds, prejudices, aspirations and traditions. All propaganda devices culminate in this one. Not to get on the German fascist band wagon is the gravest heresy, tantamount to treason. This largely accounts for reports of nearly 100 percent "Yes" votes in all Nazi plebiscites.

To What End All This Propaganda?

PROPHESIES are hazardous. We do not know the future of German Fascism. When Hitler wrote his book, *Mein Kampf*, he stated as objectives so many goals which since have been attained that the book often is called the blueprint of German Fascism. Hitler has written: "A State which . . . devotedly fosters its best racial elements is bound one day to become Master of the Earth *(Herr der Erde)*."[40]

[39] Beard, *op. cit.*, p. 267.

[40] Quoted by Beard, *op. cit.*, p. 258.

Preparation for war is today the major activity of the National Socialists. Hitler's program for expansion is as impressive as the Berlin-to-Bagdad objective of the former Kaiser. If expansion can be obtained without fighting, as in the case of Austria, by mere threat of military attack with acquiescence, support or approval of politicians, statesmen, and groups in other states, there will be no war—simply the peaceful yielding to German Fascist occupation or domination. Lands so occupied or dominated probably would experience almost immediately five major phenomena characteristic of Fascism in Germany itself:

1. The destruction of labor unions.
2. The destruction of "free enterprise" to bring business under the absolute control of the Führer.
3. The destruction of "free enterprise" in agriculture.
4. The destruction or silencing of members of the intellectual class—editors, professors, teachers, clergymen and others who by reason of native gifts, training, education, and experience are among the best equipped to analyze and appraise the policies and acts of the Führer and the hierarchy of Nazi officials.
5. A monopoly of propaganda, accompanied by coercion, to keep all the people subservient to the authoritarian will.

Preceding such occupation or domination one may expect subversive or open propaganda to make the people receptive to Fascism. This will have the support of those groups and individuals, including high public officials, who expect advantages from German Fascism. In this connection, however, a word of warning: We must guard against assuming that German Fascism or any other variety of Fascism arises from propaganda alone. German Fascism came into being not primarily because of Hitler's masterful skill as a propagandist but because conditions of unemployment, impoverishment, despair, anger, and resentment were such in Germany that any person or group offering salvation in terms sufficiently appealing could have influenced profoundly the political and economic decisions of the German people. Hitler was sufficiently appealing. With the financial support of certain individuals and the intrigues and incompetencies of men like von Papen and Hindenburg, Fascism became a reality.

It was a combination of economic breakdown, governmental weakness, and propaganda which made pre-Nazi Germany ready for Fascism. A

similar combination could bring Fascism elsewhere.

Propaganda has no meaning and hence no effectiveness except in terms of life conditions of people—their needs, fears, hatreds, loves, aspirations, prejudices, and traditions. These affect propaganda as much as propaganda affects people.[41] National Socialist propaganda was based on the hatreds, fears, aspirations, and traditions of the German people. That explains its success—that, together with the fact that most of the German people and doubtless many of the Nazi propagandists themselves were unable to analyze, evaluate, and appraise the Nazi propaganda and its possible consequences. Whether Hitler or his fellow Nazis were sincere or insincere, racketeers or honest men, is not a matter of prime importance. What is of importance is that they won to their cause honest, earnest men and women who in their turn became zealous and effective propagandists for National Socialism. These men and women knew well the despairs and aspirations of millions of Germans. Their sincerity, strengthened by those aspirations, made them powerful propagandists for German Fascism. Such a one was Pastor Martin Niemoeller who, after his war service, came back to a Fatherland torn by class strife and proletarian revolt. With the same zeal that led him to fight for his country as a captain of a German submarine, Niemoeller joined the National Socialists in 1924 to fight for a better Germany. Into his work with and for the National Socialist Party he put his patriotism, sincerity, and fervor. There must have been thousands like Pastor Niemoeller, honest earnest men whom people knew, trusted, and followed. Some of them, like Niemoeller, came to see that National Socialism (German Fascism) actually was destructive of the Germany of their hopes and aspirations; therefore, they broke with the Nazis at the risk of liberty and life. Others, not yet so disillusioned, continue to accept and promulgate German Fascism with sincerity and fervor. These are the really effective propagandists. Great and small, they are leaders of opinion in their communities. Because they are honest and respected, their influence is great. If, like Pastor Niemoeller, they come to see in German Fascism the destruction of the Germany of their aspirations, the more courageous of them may fight as zealously against Fascism as once they fought for it. The process of such disillusionment may be slow or negligible because the régime has a monopoly of propaganda.

Meanwhile, German Fascist propaganda may be expected increasingly to penetrate other lands: in some countries, such as Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Roumania, as preparation for Anschluss; elsewhere as a means of obtaining open or tacit approval of such German Fascist expansion. Card stacking must be used constantly by the National Socialists to prevent Germans and the rest of the world from knowing significant facts about German Fascism. In this connection note the proposal by Dr. Otto Dietrich,[42] Reich Press Chief, for press nonaggression pacts, providing for governmental control of printed and spoken words in all nations negotiating such treaties with Germany. Dean Carl W. Ackerman,[43] of the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, recently voiced the implications under Dr. Dietrich's proposal:

> . . . every member of the Congress of the United States, of every state legislature, all mayors and members of city or town councils, all leaders of religious, educational, labor and business groups, all public speakers and writers, would have to submit any proposed public reference to Germany, or to German officials . . . to an official censor in Washington before it could be spoken or printed.

Once the German Fascists obtain power over another nation, we may expect that pressure will be exerted, as in the case of Austria, to bring the press and all channels of communication under totalitarian control, and to silence all critics. In order to save their lives and positions some editors, writers, clergymen, teachers, business men, farmers, and others who might be adversely critical will yield to pressure. By so doing they will become part of the totalitarian propaganda system—will lend themselves to its purposes either by silence or by outspoken approval. Particularly strong will be the pressure to silence teachers and clergymen. Courageous educators will be removed[44] from their

[41] See William Graham Sumner, *Folkways*, chap. i.

[42] See *The New York Times*, March 8, 1938.

[43] Reported in *The New York Herald Tribune*, March 21, 1938.

[44] See *The New York Times*, March 28, 1938, for an account of Edward Y. Hartshorne's study of the effect of the Nazi dictatorship on German education, in which he shows that of the 1,684 professors who have been dismissed by the National Socialists almost 900 were released for being Jewish, Catholic, or "politically unreliable" and more than 700 others were dismissed for no known cause.

teaching posts and forthright clergymen and priests from their pulpits. For one Paster Niemoeller, imprisoned for his opposition, there will be others like Bishop Müller ready to accept position and prestige as a reward. For one Cardinal Faulhaber, who in Munich at great personal risk refused to accept the German Fascist concept, there will be others like Cardinal Innitzer of Austria, who urged all Austrian Roman Catholics to accept the Nazi régime.[45] Some church leaders and some churches may yield to the régime or compromise differences in formal agreements. We may then expect them to join the National Socialists in their crusade against Judaism, communism, liberalism, and democracy. If this happens, we may expect to see an increasing use of the Transfer Device whereby such church groups give their sanction and authority to justify the expanding program of the German Fascists and their allies.

Comment

In our October letter we noted that propaganda is the expression of opinion or action by individuals or groups deliberately designed to influence opinions or actions of other individuals or groups with reference to predetermined ends. We stated further that the Institute would subject propagandas to scientific analysis and seek to indicate whether they conform or not to American principles of democracy. We do not advocate the suppression of fascist propaganda in the United States, for that would imply violation of the Constitution of the United States. We do advocate analysis of these and other propagandas whether they originate abroad or in our own country. Today the most rapidly spreading propaganda is fascist, with Hitler, the master propagandist of our generation, more or less effectively copied in method and technique by numerous adherents of the fascist totalitarian philosophy.

Suggested Readings

The foregoing analysis of National Socialist propaganda can do little more than suggest the techniques used in bringing about and maintaining German Fascism. For those who wish detailed accounts to make clearer the day-to-day developments in the European situation, caused by the National Socialist program of expansion, the following books are suggested:

[45] Cf. *The New York Times*, March 29, 1938, and *The New York Sun*, March 28, 1938.

Adolf Hitler's autobiography, *Mein Kampf* (Munich: Verlag Franz Eher Nachfolger, 1933), was begun when he was thirty-five while imprisoned in the fortress of Landsberg am Lech following the abortive *Putsch* of November, 1923. It contains his program and political theories. An English edition, considerably abridged, translated by E. T. S. Dugdale, has been published under the title of *My Battle* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1937. Pp. viii + 297. $2.50).

Robert A. Brady's *The Spirit and Structure of German Fascism* (New York: The Viking Press, 1937. Pp xix + 420. $3.00) gives a vivid picture of conditions in Germany under the National Socialists.

Frederick L. Schuman's *The Nazi Dictatorship* (2nd ed., revised; New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1936. Pp. xiii + 516. $3.50) presents a clear account of the early history and propaganda of the Nazis.

Henri Lichtenberger's *The Third Reich,* translated from the French and edited by Koppel S. Pinson (New York: The Greystone Press, 1937. Pp. xi + 392. $3.00) reviews objectively the functioning of National Socialism. The appendix, containing material not readily available, and the excellent bibliography are particularly valuable.

Stephen H. Roberts' *The House that Hitler Built* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1938. Pp. xii + 380. $3.00) is a dispassionate judgment of the Hitler régime. The author, an Australian, devotes much attention to the army.

Vaso Trivanovitch's *Economic Development of Germany under National Socialism* (New York: National Industrial Conference Board, Inc., 1937. Pp. xvii + 141. $3.50) contains valuable material on such subjects as the organization and the economic position of labor and industry, foreign trade, and public finance.

Five Years of Hitler (New York: American Council on Public Affairs, 1938. Pp. 46. 15c) sets forth in headline form an account of what has happened in National Socialist Germany. The editor is M. B. Schnapper; the contributors are Frederick L. Schuman, Henry Smith Leiper, Robert A. Brady, Alice Hamilton, Charles A. Beard, and H. C. Engelbrecht.

Calvin B. Hoover's *Dictators and Democracies* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1937. Pp. xi + 110. $1.50), while not devoted solely to National Socialism, is an interpretation of developments in Germany, Italy, and Soviet Russia as illustrations of totalitarian states.

Mildred S. Wertheimer's *Germany Under Hitler* (New York: Foreign Policy Association and World Peace Foundation, 1935. Pp. 48. 25c) gives a brief, concise account of the rise of Hitler to power and of his first two years as Chancellor of the German Reich.

The New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, and *Christian Science Monitor* have carried

particularly significant day-by-day accounts which reveal all of the common propaganda devices used by the German Fascists. These newspapers should be followed for contemporary evaluation of Nazi propaganda.

The American Observer, a weekly review of social thought and action (Civic Education Service, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C., $2.00 a year), is convenient for those who lack the time to follow the day-by-day accounts in the better daily newspapers.

Vienna: March, 1938—A Footnote for Historians is "a verbatim record of the Austrian crisis, exactly as it came to CBS listeners." Free single copies may be secured by addressing the Columbia Broadcasting System, 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES AND DISCUSSION NOTES[46]

1. Discuss Germany's standing in the world of science before 1933. Is science merely knowledge or is it a method? Can it be applied in "non-scientific" fields (e.g., in politics as well as in physics and chemistry)? Does anyone think scientifically today in politics? Do believers in democracy think more scientifically than believers in other systems? *How* can we determine the answer to this question? How does the scientific method succeed better than another in discovering the truth? Is it just more critical?

2. How far is it possible for a modern leader of masses of people to remain adequately critical of his own conclusions? Does accumulating struggle, observation, tension, and conviction inevitably drive his mind into a rut (i.e., rigid dogmas reinforced by strong feelings)? Discuss this point at some length, for it is fundamental today.

3. Observe carefully and talk with unemployed people. Go to the poorest sections of town, cheap cafeterias, "flop" houses, employment agencies. Then talk with people on W.P.A., others engaged in poorly paid, uncertain work. Finally, talk with men and women in the skilled trades, trades people, merchants, middle class men and women. Study the effect of unemployment, uncertain income, economic insecurity on these different people. Are they bitter, resentful, apathetic, indifferent? How do their attitudes compare toward the kind of government we have?

4. Discuss how a creed or political philosophy that is born in struggle differs from one born in a Persian garden.

5. Assign the books in the bibliography to different members in the group. Discuss thoroughly the background and basis of German Fascism. Are scientific training and mass literacy sufficient to prevent a people from uncritical acceptance of political panaceas? Discuss the effect of reliance upon "leaders" and authority. Generalizing from the situation in Germany and from your discussion of Questions 1–4, what factors in the life of a nation do you believe would make it fertile ground for fascism? What would prevent it from accepting fascism?

6. Do most people become emotional when the subject of German Fascism is mentioned? Disregard on which side the partisanship lies, and make observations to determine to what the emotionalism is due. To fear of some coming danger? Is German Fascism merely one extreme solution imposed on a continuing social and economic conflict among us?

7. In view of prevalent propagandas, how real are our freedoms of speech, press, assembly, and

[46] *Note for Group Leaders:* This subject is the theme of a highly emotionalized world conflict. Avoid becoming involved in arguments pro or con. Make it clear at the outset, and repeatedly thereafter, that you are primarily a partisan of accuracy, if that be partisanship. Make it clear that you believe care in thinking is of more lasting importance to the human race than any single issue. Therefore, permit yourself to be checked and corrected at any time. Be willing to reconsider and, if need be, to revise your judgment. Thus, by example, set the fashion for the members of the group.

One of the far reaching effects of propaganda analysis is the development of a consciousness of one's own mental processes. After working through the discussions suggested in this volume, the members of the group should be more aware than previously of their own *assumptions* of certain ideals, objectives, relationships, of what these are and why they hold them; of the *facts* which they *know* and the sources of their information; of the *facts* which they *need to know* but have not yet ascertained.

This greater awareness, if it has been cultivated by the leader and the other members of the group in a positive manner, should not result in mere hesitation or lukewarmness on every vital issue. It should give dynamic incentive to intellectual activity in two directions. In one direction, this activity should engage in a thorough, critical house-cleaning to wipe out mental cobwebs, rusty ideas, and dusty theories and to build a fresh series of personally tested and thought-through values. In the other direction, this activity should engage in the laborious but rewarding hunt for honest facts. It should involve critical questioning regarding authorities and the authors of books and articles, of personal observations, assumptions, and theories.

There is undoubted value in theoretical discussions of such abstract ideas as truth, justice, beauty. Eventually, however, such theories must be tested by action. We can strengthen our ability to act intelligently by getting into conflict situations and learning to conduct ourselves with something of the poise of such great men as Lincoln whose enemies knew that the bitterness and passions of his contemporaries would not interfere with the compassion and mercy of his decisions.

worship? Can Germany's loss of these freedoms be made up later in better times? Will it modify Germany's whole future? May America some day be forced to choose between security and freedom? Does Lincoln's great and lasting faith in the judgment of the people omit the possibility of propagandas as powerful as those we see in the United States today?

Volume I JUNE, 1938 *Number 9*

Propaganda on the Air

IN little more than a dozen years radio has become a major channel of communication. It is an instrument of propaganda which can be more immediately effective than the press or the motion picture. Propagandas of the air travel with speed of light. Millions of listeners can hear and respond instantly. Responding to a Father Coughlin they can persuade Congress to kill our participation in the World Court or, with the help of the press, to defeat a governmental reorganization plan by picturing it as radical, dictatorial; responding to a Huey Long they can vote to make "every man a king"; responding to a Franklin Roosevelt they can overcome a New Deal opposition of 80 per cent or more of the newspapers; responding to a William J. Cameron they can marshal support for Henry Ford's belief in "individualism." There is maximum response when the propagandas are keyed to the hopes, aspirations, resentments, and hatreds of the people.

In the voices of the air are to be found all the common devices of propaganda. How are these used and to what ends? We find the answer in part in the three frameworks in which radio broadcasting takes place:

1. Democratic, with private ownership of radio broadcasting, as in the United States, with some governmental control.
2. Democratic, with public ownership of radio broadcasting, as in Great Britain, with a large measure of governmental control.
3. Totalitarian, as in Germany, with complete control by the government.

Under private ownership, as in the United States, radio broadcasting is a business operated for private profit. The policy of the major networks is to sell time for the advertising of goods and services, but not to sell time for the discussion of controversial public issues. They allot this time free as part of their service to the public. Any departure which has occurred is in direct violation of this established policy and immediately becomes a live issue within the broadcasting industry. Under private ownership there are two kinds of programs: first, the "sponsored program" which is paid for by an advertiser; second, the "sustaining program" which is provided by the broadcasting company. The sponsored programs bring to us the many propagandas of commercial advertising and, occasionally, the economic or political views of the sponsors, as in the Ford Sunday Evening Hour. Many or most are sweetened and made palatable by music or other entertainment—the formula of the old time medicine show. The sustaining programs, such as the University of Chicago Round Table or America's Town Meeting of the Air, usually carry views and opinions on controversial subjects.

Under public ownership, as in Great Britain, there is no commercial advertising over the radio. There is, however, some competition of political and economic propagandas.

Under the totalitarian system there is a monopoly of propaganda and with it complete control of radio as a channel of communication. By selection and emphasis, by suppression and distortion, the totalitarian régime uses radio to inculcate the political, social, and cultural attitudes and beliefs it considers necessary or desirable. It holds as unpatriotic or as treasonable refusal to listen to its more significant political broadcasts; it punishes those who are discovered listening to forbidden broadcasts which originate in radio stations beyond its control. When Hitler occupied Austria one of the first moves of the German Fascist régime was to take over the Austrian radio.

Freedom to discuss governmental domestic policies and issues is large in the United States. It is more restricted in Great Britain, and non-existant in Germany. Freedom to discuss foreign policies is likewise non-existant in Germany, is considerably restricted in England, but is large in the United States.[1] Radio listeners in Germany, for example, have no opportunity to hear the propagandas "for" and "against" intervention in Spain and "for" and "against" the British-Italian agreement approving Italy's seizure of Ethiopia and giving tacit recognition to Franco. In the United States propagandas flowing from such controversial issues probably have had a wider hearing over the radio[2] than in any other democratic country. David Sarnoff,[3] president of the Radio Corporation of America, speaking of broadcasting in totalitarian countries, said:

> Broadcasting in those autocracies serves the interest, convenience and necessity, not of the public, but of totalitarian government. It is allowed to present only one side of public issues. . . . It is no coincidence that where freedom of thought and of speech are denied on the air, they are equally denied on the platform, in the university, and in the church. It is no coincidence that where you find broadcasting enslaved, you also find a slavish press.

The American System

American radio, with its greater freedom, provides many kinds of programs, disseminates many propagandas. However, to this American "freedom of the air" apply several restrictions.

The first is physical. Because the number of available wave lengths for radio broadcasting is limited, the number of radio stations must be limited. To prevent interference and "jamming," only those stations may broadcast which are licensed by the Federal Communications Commission. A license may be revoked if the Commission finds that the broadcasting company is not serving "public interest, convenience, and necessity." In practice, licenses are granted for six month periods only.

While the law which sets forth the powers of the Commission withholds from it power to "interfere with the right of free speech," some see possibilities for censorship in the interpretation and application of the law, among them David Sarnoff,[4] who recently said:

> While direct Government censorship over radio programs is . . . forbidden by law, the terms of the Government licenses leave the door open for an indirect — and more insidious — censorship. Any attempt to impose the ordinary "blue pencil" censorship is little to be feared, because, being a conspicuous violation of the right of free speech, it would arouse a storm of public protest. But what is not conspicuous — and is therefore dangerous — is the effect on the mind of the broadcaster, resulting from attitudes that may be taken by the government toward stations, on matters outside the regulation of facilities.
>
> Fear of disapproval can blue-pencil a dozen programs for every one that an official censor might object to. While practically nobody advocates a pre-program blue-pencil in the hands of government, few realize that post-program discipline by the government can be a form of censorship that is all the more severe because it is undefined.

A more important restriction than that thus far imposed by the Federal Government is inherent in American radio as in any other business operated for profit. Some radio stations, like some newspapers, are not eager to disseminate propagandas repugnant to influential advertisers. This is explained by the fact that broadcasting, like any other business, or like preaching or school teaching, takes on the color

---

[1] Eugene J. Young, cable editor of *The New York Times*, in his book, *Looking Behind the Censorships* (New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1938), tells how difficult it is for the most competent newspaper reporters to discover what is going on in the field of foreign policy. This is true also in democratic countries like Great Britain and the United States, where, despite the democratic form of government, the foreign office carries on much of its work behind a censorship. Mr. Young tells that our own State Department's use of censorship is such that occasionally American newspapers first learn about important Washington developments by reports from their foreign correspondents in European capitals. A policy of secrecy which hides facts makes discussion of facts difficult or impossible and thus serves to restrict freedom of the air as well as freedom of the press. "Open covenants openly arrived at" was an American World War slogan which, however sincere in its initial statement, soon became a Glittering Generality.

[2] In *The Psychology of Radio* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1935) the authors, Hadley Cantril and Gordon W. Allport, state that "when all things are considered, freedom of the air in America is probably as great as in most other countries and is certainly greater than in some."

[3] "The American System of Broadcasting and Its Function in the Preservation of Democracy," an address at the Town Hall Luncheon, Hotel Astor, New York City, April 28, 1938, p. 11.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 8–9.

of the prevailing social order.[5] Even so, sustaining programs often disseminate opinions or propagandas critical of the prevailing social order.

A possible restriction of freedom is inherent in the National Association of Broadcasters'[6] code of ethics. For example: 1. No program shall offend public taste and common decency. (Let our readers try defining "public taste" and "common decency.") 2. No program shall be planned as an attack on the United States Government, its officers or otherwise constituted authorities or its fundamental principles. (What is an "attack"? What are "fundamental principles"? Would defenders of or apologists for presidential policies be guilty of "attacking"?) 3. No program shall be conceived or presented for the purpose of deliberately offending the racial, religious, or otherwise socially conscious groups of the community. (What is offensive and when is it deliberate? Would a church attack on Franco, Hitler, Neville Chamberlain, or the Vatican, or a church defense of these be offensive?)

Advertisers who buy time on the air have commercial reasons for pleasing a maximum number of listeners and, if possible, offending nobody.

To reach the lowest common denominator of listener appeal, with its emphases on popular music, popular humor, popular sentiment, common emotions, and widely accepted stereotypes, commercial broadcasters have taken over the "showmanship" concept from the theater, vaudeville, and the movies.[7]

In response to the need of advertisers to reach a maximum number of listeners has come the development of nationwide network broadcasting. This has tended to reduce the number of programs originating in local stations, to reduce the contribution of regional cultures as feeders of the national cultural pool. Increasingly, we draw our national radio culture from a few major reservoirs, chiefly New York and Hollywood, with a few inter-connected centers, such as Washington, D. C. and Chicago.[8]

It is natural, therefore, that the American radio, like the American movies (see PROPAGANDA ANALYSIS for March, 1938) should reveal a tendency to perpetuate commonly accepted stereotypes; even so, the fact remains that the American system provides us with more quantity and probably, in the net, with more quality than is to be heard by listeners in other countries. Despite restrictions American stations do provide something of that freedom of controversy which is the life of public opinion and the essence of democracy.

Note the policy of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., as expressed by its president, William S. Paley:[9]

> . . . the Columbia Network has pledged itself not only to freedom of the air but to non-partisanship and fairness of the air.
>
> By freedom of the air we mean the right of any speaker to express his views, subject only to general laws and the laws of libel and slander, the rule that he may not seek to provoke racial or religious hatred and the ordinary limitations of good taste and the decorum appropriate to the homes of the nation.
>
> By non-partisanship we mean that broadcasting as an instrument of American democracy must forever be wholly, honestly and militantly non-partisan. This is true not only in politics, but in the whole realm of arguable social ideas. . . .
>
> By fairness we mean that no discussion must ever be one-sided so long as any qualified spokesman wants to take the other side. The party in power must never dominate the air. No majority must ever monopolize. Minorities must always have fair opportunities to express themselves.

Both CBS and NBC in the 1936 presidential election, despite opposition of anti-Communist groups, broadcast the campaign speeches of Earl Browder, Communist candidate for president. In this action, the networks followed the federal law which provides that minority party candidates be permitted to buy radio time.

Censorship whether by a government, a

[5] As Professor William Graham Sumner wrote in his book, *Folkways*, most individuals do not oppose or approve opposition to the generally accepted habits, customs, mores, folkways; yet it is only by free criticism of these that the ones which have outlived their usefulness to society may be supplanted by new and more socially useful ways of thinking and acting.

[6] *Broadcasting in the United States* (Washington: National Association of Broadcasters, 1933), p. 16.

[7] For clear descriptions, almost formulas, of how successful broadcasters obtain and hold audiences, see Kenneth M. Goode's *What About Radio?* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1937).

[8] American broadcasting is dominated by the four major chains: the National Broadcasting Company with its Red and Blue networks of 148 owned or affiliated stations, the Columbia Broadcasting System with 115 stations, and the Mutual with 83 stations.

[9] *Annual Report of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.* for the Fiscal Year ending January 1, 1938, New York, April 15, 1938, pp. 4–5.

group, or an individual illustrates the common propaganda device of stacking the cards to prevent a fair hearing. Examples are cited by various writers.[10]

Radio Commentators

News dissemination and interpretation by radio offers constant opportunity for propaganda by commission and omission, by over-emphasis and under-emphasis. Because of its brevity, news-casting may be less "colored" than more extended reporting, but the speaker's voice often conveys marked editorial emphasis. In this connection remember James Harvey Robinson's comment that language is largely an emotional outlet, "corresponding to various cooings, growlings, snarls, crowings, and brayings." The exclamation "Oh" or "Ah" can reflect approval or disdain. Boake Carter's voice is more important than his words. If one writes out his sentences, they don't ordinarily sound harsh; if one remembers the snarl in his words the effect is different, suggesting the propaganda device of Name Calling. Because of the size of their audiences and the potentialities of the human voice, radio news commentators may shape public opinion much more than newspaper editorials.

Commentators, like editorial and advertising writers, seldom are wholly free to say what they like. Alexander Woollcott, the "Town Crier," was relieved of his contract with "Cream of Wheat" when he refused, in his words, "to keep quiet about Hitler, Mussolini, or any other bully, jingo, or lyncher." What the sponsor minded was not so much what Woollcott said about the dictators, but the fact that admirers of the dictators were boycotting his product. Had Woollcott praised Hitler and Mussolini the results doubtless would have been the same.

In an early issue we shall analyze the Ford Sunday Evening Hour. We suspect John T. Flynn referred to this program in his recent speech at the Town Meeting of the Air,[11] when he said:

> On Sunday evening the family is gathered in the living room when into their midst float the strains of music from a great symphony orchestra. In millions of homes people are listening. This goes on for half an hour. Then as the strains of some well-loved old song fade from the air and the family sits around, thoroughly softened up, there floats into the room and into the unguarded chambers of their minds the voice of the propagandist. For five or ten minutes the carefully planned infection flows. . . . It tells of the romantic saga of business, the great achievements, the massive wisdom, the matchless courage, the civilizing alchemy of the great business man as distinguished from the selfish and narrow ignorance and wickedness of the Government—the great-souled business leader compared with the small-minded and vicious Senator.

[10] Ruth Brindze, *Not To Be Broadcast* (New York: Vanguard Press, 1937), Minna Kassner and Lucien Zacharoff, *Radio is Censored* (New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 1936), Lillian Hurwitz, *Radio Censorship* (New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 1932), Cantril and Allport, *The Psychology of Radio.*

[11] "Is Our Public Opinion Controlled by Propaganda?" *Bulletin of America's Town Meeting of the Air,* Vol. 3, No. 24, April 18, 1938, pp. 12–13.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES AND DISCUSSION NOTES

1. It is well known that every now and then some groups raise a hue and cry over attacks which, they claim, are directed against our fundamental institutions. Some of these groups belong to minority parties or consist of people with more radical views, who believe their freedom to speak and assemble is threatened. Others are made up of the people who benefit most from the *status quo* and fear the changes that are being proposed. Ask a number of people situated in different circumstances what they mean when they make the above claims. Write down their views. From these sum up what the various groups appear to fear most. Finally, in your own sober view, write what you think is threatening America's basic institutions. Date your work and repeat it in the midst of the next presidential election, securing data from radio and press and interviews.

2. Describe what may happen in the next hundred years if propaganda is unchecked, continues to be more effective, and is not accompanied by education in understanding its nature.

3. Visit classrooms, adult groups, public meetings, listen to radio discussions and talks, and keep track of the length of time given to views already determined and being propagated and of the length of time in which facts and invitations are offered to call out the new, original thinking of listeners or participants.

4. Rank five radio commentators according to

your judgment of their accuracy and adequacy of facts, impartiality of interpretation, absence of prejudice, emotional poise, technique of appeal.

5. If individuals and groups can buy radio time, sponsor programs, own stations, and thus promote their own propagandas, should local, state, and federal governments do likewise? Compare the effect on the people of the following systems: suppression of all opinion except the official government propaganda; equal freedom of opinion and facilities for expression of major points of view including that of the party in office; equal freedom of opinion and facilities for expression of major points of view but none for the party in office.

6. Discuss methods by which radio programs may be selected, enjoyed, and participated in by all members of the family.

Volume I JULY, 1938 *Number 10*

The Ford Sunday Evening Hour

HENRY FORD is a man of strong opinions, which is to say, strong propagandas. More than a generation ago he had the opinion that the horse and buggy should be supplanted by the horseless carriage. Thanks largely to his inventive genius, his energy, his industry, to his propaganda for the "Tin Lizzies," and to government coöperation in building roads for them to run on, his idea was realized. When the World War came, he had an opinion about that: it could be ended by the right kind of propaganda. So he sailed on a "Peace Ship" to "get the boys out of the trenches by Christmas." That propaganda failed. When the United States entered the war, Ford changed his opinion. He built and sold automotive equipment and Eagle Boats to "help win the war."

Ford's derogatory opinion of Jews was another propaganda. It was expressed in anti-Semitic articles published in his paper, *The Dearborn Independent,* on the editorial staff of which was William J. Cameron, the present Ford spokesman on the radio program known as the Ford Sunday Evening Hour. When a number of libel suits were brought against Ford as a result of his anti-Jewish propaganda in *The Dearborn Independent,* he repudiated the offensive statements, said they had been published without his knowledge.

In his talks over the Columbia Broadcasting System's network, Mr. Cameron has disseminated so much propaganda on controversial matters that the Ford Sunday Evening Hour promises soon to become a live issue within the broadcasting industry. As we stated in our June letter, it is the policy of the major networks not to sell time for propaganda on controversial public issues. This policy Mr. Cameron has violated. What C.B.S. will do about it, we do not know. There may be a lively contest soon between Mr. Ford and C.B.S., probably behind closed doors. It seems hardly possible that any major network can long continue to permit a commercial broadcaster to use radio time to utter opinions or propagandas which arouse sharp opposition. Some listeners may ask that another side be heard, obviously an impractical solution on commercial time; denied this privilege, their resentment against the buyer of time is turned against the company which sells the time.

But who is William J. Cameron whose talks have raised this issue? According to a newspaper comment (*New York Post,* April 29, 1938) he dismisses questions about his background with the phrase "of Scotch descent"; doesn't disclose his age, middle name, birthplace, or names of parents. Before his connection with Ford's *Dearborn Independent* he wrote editorials for *The Detroit News;* before that he was a preacher. His radio talks, like those of Father Coughlin, reveal pulpit oratorical methods standardized for certain forms of sermons.

Mr. Cameron still is much interested in Jews. He has been president of the Anglo-Saxon Federation of America, with offices in Detroit, Michigan; more recently member of the editorial board of its magazine, *Destiny*. The members of this group hold the theory that the inhabitants of the British Isles are the descendants of the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel. In a tract, explaining this theory, Mr. Cameron has written:

We know the divine destiny that Israel was commissioned to fulfill. We know that Israel left Pales-

tine, while the Jews remained. We can trace Israel out of the East and across Europe to their new settlement in the Isles.

How much Mr. Ford influences Mr. Cameron and how much Mr. Cameron influences Mr. Ford, we do not know. Undoubtedly each influences the opinions and the propagandas of the other.[1]

Each year, for thirty-nine Sunday evenings, since October, 1934, the Ford Motor Company has sponsored an hour of symphonic music over the Columbia Broadcasting System. The programs are "kept within the widest range of general interest," (Edsel Ford, October 7, 1934) and instrumental and vocal soloists appear with the orchestra. The three products of the Company are mentioned only once.

Approximately six minutes of the hour are devoted to talks by Mr. Cameron, who would be identified as the Company's public relations counsel except that the "Ford Motor Company has no public relations department and employs no public relations counsel or 'spokesman.'" ("Public Relations," February 14, 1937.)[2]

The purpose of the talks, according to Mr. Edsel Ford (October 7, 1934), is to "try to bring variety to these programs by talking over . . . some topic of general interest, or answering certain questions about our company that are widely asked." According to Mr. Cameron (October 7, 1934) the talks are designed to assist the American people in understanding their various interests by supplying them with accurate information and sound experience. The Company has "a deep interest and confidence in American principles, but . . . no partisan purpose or interest whatsoever." ("Light Ahead," September 29, 1935.) The talks are devoted "to matters of general interest and information, to the service of common sense and to the building of a balanced and fearless confidence based on facts." ("Third Season," September 20, 1936.) Again, at the close of the 1935–36 series Mr. Cameron ("End of the Season," June 21, 1936) said: "We had no theories to propagate. We are not professional reformers and have no political axe to grind. Not even in behalf of capitalism did we offer any special plea."

The Talks as Propaganda

An analysis of the talks reveals clear-cut propaganda in many of them. Behind them is the personality of Henry Ford, his opinions and convictions. In effect Henry Ford is doing the talking. His philosophy of individualism, his type of Americanism, and his trust in a competitive system run all through the talks.

In talk after talk he makes "the American way" synonymous with the Ford way. Anti-Ford becomes anti-American. For example, Mr. Cameron devoted a talk ("Will Hard Times Come Again?" March 8, 1936) to the taxation of surpluses. His Company was never mentioned; but we were told that the American way is quite clear upon this point, that taxation of surpluses is not American. If Mr. Cameron had stated that the Ford Motor Company does not want a tax upon corporate surpluses, he would have been saying baldly what was conveyed by indirection. In discussing "Good Will and Common Sense," (December 9, 1934) Mr. Cameron stated that the American doctrine is that progress is only beginning. He then said: "A new social plan now being offered us – a new political talking point – is called Unemployment Insurance. It was invented in countries that have accepted unemployment and poverty as final conditions."

Mr. Ford Is "Plain Folks"

The entire Hour is designed to create a "plain folks" atmosphere. As noted above, the musical selections are kept "within the widest range of general interest." (Edsel Ford, October 7, 1934.) The lighter works of composers are often chosen. The Hour ends on a reverent note with a hymn in which the audience is asked to join.

Henry Ford is pictured as a common, ordinary American. We are told how he shares the great American sentiment for McGuffey *Readers* and old American songs. (W. J. Cameron, October 7, 1934.) One talk entitled "Just Circulating 'Round" (October 14, 1934) states that Mr. Ford's desk is never used by him and that when last seen it was covered with boxes of wax dolls. And further:

The only letters he [Mr. Ford] takes time to write with his own hand are to little boy and girl friends

[1] For accounts of Henry Ford's life the reader is referred to his autobiography written in collaboration with Samuel Crowther, *My Life and Work* (New York: Garden City Publishing Co., Inc., 1922, out of print) and Upton Sinclair's *The Flivver King* (published and distributed by the author, Station A, Pasadena, California, 25c).

[2] Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations are taken from Mr. Cameron's Sunday Evening Hour talks.

who are having a birthday. . . . He will nail up a door for a whole season rather than disturb a robin's nest; he has postponed the hay harvest because ground birds were brooding in the field. . . . Rising at 6 in the morning, he is often one of the tens of thousands of Ford men going to work. . . .

Mr. Cameron says that Ford is so little interested in profits *per se* that "it makes hard-fisted money-makers wonder why Mr. Ford is in business at all." ("The Money Flow," May 23, 1937.) Ford as a youth working on his first gasoline engine in the kitchen of an ordinary two-story double brick house "manipulated the fly-wheel . . . [while] his young wife poured the gasoline drop by drop . . . into the intake check valve." ("The First Little Shop," October 20, 1935.) Mr. Ford inspired the verse of Edgar Guest ("Henry Ford," March 29, 1936) beginning with the lines:

> He started to sing as he tackled the thing
> That couldn't be done, and he did it.

"His greatest personal pleasure—creating more jobs. His constant goal — higher and yet higher wages. . . . Faces the future unperturbed, with faith in American people and American destiny." *(Ibid.)*

Since Henry Ford *is* the Ford Motor Company, the effect of this use of the Plain Folks device is to develop the impression that the Company is in reality nothing more than a benevolent organization, uninterested in profits, ready to sacrifice an economic advantage for a humane principle, engaged in manufacturing automobiles solely to create jobs and raise wages. The device, thus used, reduces a gigantic industrial empire to the scale of a company which is merely the image of a simple, kindly, generous, democratic man. The Company becomes "plain folks, just like us."

Mr. Ford and "Virtue" Words

Freedom, independence, initiative, invention, industry, truth, and loyalty are "virtue" words with which the propagandist seeks to associate his program.

Consider "freedom." Mr. Cameron uses it in the sense of *laissez-faire*. "Freedom" becomes the right of industry, that is of the Ford Motor Company, to operate without governmental interference. "Individualism," he says, ("American Individualism," October 28, 1934) is composed of "four elements — Initiative, Invention, Industry, Independence." The "anti-individualism" trend which has appeared in recent years becomes, therefore, an attack upon these four "virtues." Further, since "Initiative, Invention, Industry, and Independence" are all inherent in the American character, and since all of them together compose "Individualism," an attack upon "Individualism" is an attack upon the American character and upon Mr. Ford.

In one talk ("The McGuffey Readers," March 17, 1935) the Company not only becomes a concrete example of these "virtues," but it becomes the supporter of "truthfulness, industry, consideration for the weak, kindness, respect of conscience, a firm reliance on the right to justify itself always and everywhere. . . . " These were the "tonic iron" that McGuffey in his *Readers* "distilled for the soul of young America." Mr. Cameron then goes on to say: "Many wish that our present public education might be made the means of character formation that it was in McGuffey's day. We are trying to restore that type of teaching at Greenfield Village."

What appears to be a consistent policy of Mr. Cameron is to make several talks that, taken separately, seem to have no propaganda intent, but, when viewed in the light of subsequent talks, become an important part of the whole. For instance, he devoted three of his talks in succession to eulogies of the late King George V, of the American Constitution, and of Thomas Alva Edison. (January 26, February 2, February 9, 1936.) These were followed by a talk entitled "Nothing Good Is Lost," (February 16, 1936) a defense of machinery and technological improvement, and by implication, of the Ford Motor Company. This policy of Mr. Cameron might be compared to that of the "change of pace" of a baseball pitcher, a method by which the thrower outwits the batter by giving him a few slow balls and then throws a fast one. Thus, during the 1935–1936 season Mr. Cameron devoted sixteen of his thirty-nine talks to such subjects as "American Sport," "Thanksgiving," "Christmas," "The Feast of Good Will," "George Washington," "The Light of Easter," and "Mother's Day." Some of these were by no means devoid of propaganda, but they may be distinguished from another group of talks on "Buildings and Motors," "Who Owns the United States?" "Who Gets The Income?" and "Business and Recovery" which were largely propaganda. A talk on "American Sport" (October 6, 1935)

developed into a study of its competitive nature; and from this the deduction was drawn that "our American sport contests have a lesson for all statesmen inoculated with foreign theories."

By devoting nearly half his talks to subjects that do not on the surface contain propaganda, Mr. Cameron builds up our "receptivity" and lowers our "resistance" to talks which contain propaganda.

Heroes and Villains

Name Calling is frequently implied or used by Mr. Cameron when he talks about writers and politicians. Just as production engineers are the "heroes" of his discourses, writers and politicians are the "villains." In discussing certain types of writers he applies to them the label of "the so-called intelligentsia" and says ("Liberal Youth," October 18, 1936):

> Fostering itself within itself as most ingrowing aberrations do, itself writing books about itself for itself to read, delivering lectures to itself, drawing its bread ration from the system it pretends to despise, and seriously believing its own inflation to be substantial power, it presents a clear-cut pathological condition.

In a talk entitled "The 'Speed Up' " (November 7, 1937) he made the point that magazine articles critical of the factory assembly line and the "speed up" are usually written by those who are obviously never meant for mechanical work, certainly not for factory work. In this same talk Mr. Cameron recommended an article in *The Reader's Digest*[3] for the "real, *inside* story" of the assembly line.

But if adversely critical writers are bad, politicians are worse. For instance:

> Public life with its deplorable standards; oaths of office notoriously violated; rampant disorders abetted and protected by political power; public utterances scandalously unreliable — these are infinitely more costly to the nation than legal crime. We have witnessed not merely a departure from principles of rectitude in public life, but a shocking ignorance that anything like principle exists. What formerly was concealed for shame, now passes for bad political cleverness. ("For Character and Country," March 21, 1937.)

Government had nothing to do with the bringing of the motor and aviation age into being, according to Mr. Cameron. ("Horse and Buggy Age," October 25, 1936.) The vast program of public highways which made possible the utilization of the automobile he does not mention. He does not allude to government regulations to safeguard citizens against automobile accidents nor to the need for increased government expenditures to combat types of crimes made more easily possible by the automobile.

In summary, Mr. Cameron's talks stack the cards in favor of the Ford Motor Company and against writers, government officials, labor leaders, and others who do not approve of Ford policies. This obviously is what he is paid to do. He does it effectively.

[3] Christy Borth, special assignment writer for the *Detroit Free Press*, wrote "Americana: On the Line" (*The Reader's Digest*, July, 1937) in reply to Gene Richard's "Time Clock No. 1135284" (*The Atlantic Monthly*, April, 1937 and *The Reader's Digest*, May, 1937).

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES AND DISCUSSION NOTES

1. Discuss the following assumption and its prevalence: "All that is needed to bring peace and order, either internationally or between employers and employés, is goodwill among men. There is no basic difference between opponents in either field, but ill will nourished by agitation and propaganda."

2. Speakers frequently use the term "an ordinary American." Discuss him, try to understand him, and describe him realistically.

3. American business has advanced with leaps and bounds in its ability to produce a variety of goods on an immense scale. This rapid advance is due largely to two factors, both of which involve careful and accurate thinking: excellent organization for economical mass production and distribution, and the use of constantly improved inventions, machinery, and scientific discoveries, particularly in physics, chemistry, and electricity. Discuss the effect of these factors on our attitude toward business methods, business theories and propaganda.

4. It is recommended that the group purchase and study together *Technological Trends and National Policy* (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1937, pp. 388, $1.00), a report of the Subcommittee on Technology to the National Resources Committee. In a forceful and most readable manner the report shows some of the social aspects of technical developments, the relationship between science and technology, and technical developments in various fields.

Volume I AUGUST, 1938 *Number 11*

The Public Relations Counsel and Propaganda

AS FAR as Hollywood is concerned, all newspapermen are drunkards, crime doesn't pay, virtue always triumphs, and press agents, while they mean well, of course, somehow cannot realize until the very last reel that Mona Mari, the glamorous movie star, would rather have love than money, or even her career. It's bad enough when they ask Miss Mari to bathe in milk, wear overalls, and keep trained lions as pets – all in the interest of publicity. When they smash her engagement by concocting an imaginary romance with her leading man that makes page one in the *New York Times,* however – well, that is just too much. "Is nothing sacred to you?" Miss Mari storms. "Will you stop at nothing to get another story into the papers?" And, tearing her contract to confetti, she hurtles from the press agent's office, while the agent, sputtering in amazement, leaps for the nearest telephone.

Now, there may be press agents like that; in fact, there probably are – in Hollywood, where Marlene Dietrich wears pants, Garbo talks only to Leopold Stokowski, people are engaged for the morning papers, and divorced for the afternoons. Press agents there seem to stay up all night thinking of Samuel Goldwynisms to put in Samuel Goldwyn's mouth; plans are proposed for plastering the pyramids of Egypt with posters.

Nevertheless, it would hardly be too much to say that, on the whole, the average press agent resembles the Hollywood stereotype as closely as the average newspaperman resembles the wild but ah! so brilliant movie reporter. He doesn't wear loud-checked suits. He doesn't talk in exclamation points. He doesn't shout "Wadda story! Wadda story!" If he's doing publicity for an industrial corporation, he probably refers to himself as Public Relations Director or Vice-president in Charge of Public Relations; has an elaborate office; and helps to shape the corporation's every policy. If he's in business for himself, then he probably uses the imposing title, Counsel on Public Relations.

In spite of the movies, he isn't particularly worried about grabbing space in the papers. He doesn't want so much to attract public attention; he wants rather to mold the public's mind. And newspaper publicity is just one tool among many whereby he can do this. (There are times, in fact, when the public relations counsel may even decide that newspaper publicity is undesirable. For example, Alva Johnston in his article, "Jimmy's Got It," tells how George Washington Hill, of the American Tobacco Company, was advised by Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross that should he decide to have himself insured for $10,000,000, as Theodore M. Riehle, the insurance agent, had suggested, it would be unwise from the standpoint of public relations to publicize the fact. Investors, they said, might conclude that he was in bad health.)

The public relations counsel knows the value of concealing his own motives, the motives of his clients, and, if need be, even the identity of his clients. For, with few exceptions, those motives are never altruistic. It is the rare organization, indeed, that is willing to spend as much as $500,000 in one year for public relations (and even bigger sums have been spent) just from an over-powering sense of civic duty. On the other hand, if special pleading is recognized for what it really is, then it loses much of its effect. So the public relations counsel masks his special pleading in luscious, mouth-filling virtue words, Glittering Generalities. And he masks the identity of his clients by creating an organization, with some high-sounding name, to carry on the propaganda.

"Institutes" and "Foundations"

Generally, he prefers to create an institute or foundation. There is something about the very words "institute" and "foundation" that seems almost to mesmerize the American people. They conjure up visions of *Arrowsmith:* white-tiled laboratories, serious, young scientists, microscopes, guinea-pigs – giving their all for humanity. They make the public think

of the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, the Brookings Institution, all the other institutes and foundations that have done so much to further the quest for knowledge. Thus, by creating an "institute" or "foundation," the public relations counsel transfers the prestige of those devoted to public service to the one he would use to achieve a private end – the Transfer device.

The public relations counsel establishes the American Economic Foundation, the Edison Electric Institute, the Radio Institute of the Audible Arts, the Temperature Research Foundation, the Cleanliness Institute, the Asphalt Roofing and Shingle Institute, and countless others. Each, he tells us, has been created in our interests; each wants only to serve us. Just like the Rockefeller Foundation; just like the Brookings Institution.

A high-sounding name, however, is not enough. A high-sounding board of directors is also needed: leaders in public life, well-known business men, educators, scientists. These can always be found. Some will lend their names from sincere conviction. George Sylvester Viereck, for example, has often lent not only his name but even his time and talents and money to pro-German organizations, for Mr. Viereck has been intensely pro-German since his college days, and even during the World War hysteria, when pro-German sympathies meant persecution. Similarly, Carl Crow and Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., who are helping Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc. with its pro-China campaign, could hardly be suspected of acting from any but the highest motives. Nevertheless, there are those only too ready to serve as directors of any propaganda organization which will pay them enough. And there are others who, although they receive no money, hope for another kind of compensation – publicity, for example, or special favors.

America's outstanding exponent of the institute has long been Edward L. Bernays; in fact, he might even be credited with inventing this type of institute. Some time ago, before the World War and before the facts of life had achieved their present esteem, Richard Bennett, the actor, decided to produce Brieux's play, *Damaged Goods.* He was afraid, however, that his show might be raided by the police; and to prevent this, he retained Mr. Bernays as public relations counsel. Mr. Bernays, who then was the editor of the *Dietetic Health Gazette* and the *Medical Review of Reviews,* organized the Sociological Fund and for it solicited members from New York's 400. The avowed purpose of the organization was to fight venereal disease through education. Its real purpose was to make the public receptive to Brieux's play.

Apparently the plan worked: the police didn't touch *Damaged Goods;* and Mr. Bernays was convinced that his plan really had potentialities. The result is that Mr. Bernays has since created more institutes, funds, institutions, and foundations than Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Filene together. Typical of them was the Temperature Research Foundation. Its stated purpose was "to disseminate impartial, scientific information concerning the latest developments in temperature control as they affect the health, leisure, happiness, and economy of the American people." A minor purpose – so minor that rarely did Mr. Bernays remember even to mention it – was to boost the sales of Kelvinator refrigerators, air-conditioning units, and electric stoves.

Another type of organization that the counsel on public relations likes to establish is the citizens' committee. Nothing is more basic to the democratic idea than is the right of like-minded citizens to band together in order to further their views. It was such committees – the Committees on Correspondence – which helped start the American Revolution.

However, it takes organizational ability, time, and, most important of all, money to establish a citizens' committee. The public relations counsel, who is well-paid by his clients, has all three. What is more, prominent sponsors can just as easily be lined up for a committee as for an institute, and for exactly the same reasons. So we find that John Price Jones had an energetic finger in the formation of the Citizens' National Committee, which received so much publicity in the papers last year.

Now the question arises: how does the public relations counsel get his ideas before the public? Naturally, he does not want to use advertising: the advertisement is obvious special pleading, and obvious special pleading, as has already been noted, is relatively ineffectual. Consequently, the public relations counsel attempts to slip his propaganda into the press as news, features, or editorials; into the newsreels under the same guise; into the magazines as unbiased articles, written by disinterested au-

thorities; into the ether as sustaining radio programs; and into the movies.

His simplest, though not in any sense his most potent, technique is merely to print brochures and pamphlets and to distribute them, under the name of his institute, among the nation's "leaders of public opinion." These are the public officials in every community, the leading business men, bankers, educators, civic leaders, and newspaper editors, who have the respect of their fellow citizens, and whose opinions carry weight. No doubt you have received many of these publications. They come from the American Iron and Steel Institute, the Edison Electric Institute, the National Association of Manufacturers, and hundreds of similar organizations. Not long ago the Sutton News Service was sending them out for the Japanese Chamber of Commerce to combat the boycott of Japanese goods. (In 1933, the Farm Equipment Institute retained three college professors to answer the charges of two government agencies that prices of farm machinery were too high. A report was prepared by the professors; the American Society of Agricultural Engineers, of which they were all members, agreed to sponsor it. And the very government agencies that had attacked the farm equipment industry reprinted excerpts from the professors' report and circulated them widely – completely unaware that, instead of being an unbiased, objective study, it was paid [if well disguised] propaganda against themselves.)

The Newspaper Release

The most common technique is the newspaper release (newspapermen call them "handouts," but the counsel on public relations abhors that word). These are mimeographed articles, written in newspaper style, which, the public relations counsel is convinced, have news value. Sometimes they have. They may, for example, describe an important and news-worthy contribution to science and industry that has recently been made by the press agent's client. Or again, the client's employés may have gone on strike; their union naturally has made demands and charges; the newspaper release will outline the company's defense.

On the whole, however, these newspaper releases are simply advertisements written as news. They are printed either because the newspaper does not hire enough reporters and is, therefore, short of copy, or else because the publisher thinks he will be able to get advertising from the company if his paper runs its propaganda.

Occasionally, when his client has done nothing of news-interest and he wants to get more space in the papers than he can with releases that are blatant advertising, the public relations counsel will make news. He may stage luncheons, dinners, or conferences, at which prominent men will speak. (The speakers, it goes without saying, will always express the very ideas that he wants to pound into the public's mind.) He may hold contests, like the soap-sculpture contest of the Cleanliness Institute; he may arrange for the award of scholarships to worthy high school graduates; he may arrange such events as the "Golden Jubilee of Light," at which Thomas Edison reënacted the invention of the incandescent lamp.

New refinements in the press agent's technique are the "news bureaus." These masquerade, though not always with success, as regular news agencies like the Associated Press, the United Press, and the International News Service. They distribute news, pictures, features, and editorials without charge to any paper that would rather save on its editorial budget than print legitimate news. One such organization is Six Star Service, maintained by the National Association of Manufacturers. Among its products is the feature "Uncle Abner Says." Another is the Health News Service, which supplies news of developments in the field of public health – in order to boost the consumption of milk. Still another is the Fashion Worth News, which supplies news of fashions – in order to boost the sale of Cluett Peabody Co. shirts. The Foremost Feature Service sends eleven or twelve news pictures each week to any paper that wants them, but three or four of the pictures are really disguised propaganda.

And do you read the "Letters to the Editor" column in your paper? Surely there can't be propaganda there: just letters from readers with an idea. Yet, according to Walter Winchell, an investigation by New York City editors recently showed that half of the letters they received had originated in one publicity office. And the American Newspaper Publishers Association has frequently pointed out to its members the amazing similarity between letters that supposedly have been written by several different people.

Pulchritude and Propaganda

Pick up your newspaper again. Scattered through it are pictures of pretty girls with slender ankles, shapely legs. Most of them are skimpily dressed – in bathing suits, perhaps – and they are swimming, playing tennis, surfboard riding, dancing at (the captions are careful to mention) Spring Lake, N. J.; Sun Valley, Idaho; Old Point Comfort, Va.; Miami and Miami Beach, Fla. Most of those girls are professional actresses. Many of them were posed for the photographs by Carl Byoir, Steve Hannagan, or Hamilton Wright.

If you want to see them again, drop into your neighborhood movie house. They'll be in the newsreels, swimming, playing tennis, surfboard riding, etc., again to publicize Spring Lake, N. J., Sun Valley, Idaho, etc.

The ether is just as cluttered with propaganda as the press. Often, radio broadcasters are unable to sell time during the morning hours, and they are therefore forced to put on sustaining programs. These cost money, and they bring no revenue. So the public relations counsel prepares talks, has them mimeographed, and sends them free of charge to radio stations. Now the station does not have to spend money on script-writers. It can have its announcer read the prepared talk. Occasionally, the public relations counsel may hire some one to write dramatic sketches, hire actors to present them, and have the show recorded. He will then mail out the records, and the radio stations will be able to put these interesting dramatic programs on the air – for nothing.

One such recorded program is the "American Family Robinson," distributed by the National Association of Manufacturers. More than 150 radio stations are said to use it. Another is George E. Sokolsky's weekly review of the news, also distributed by the N.A.M.

It is somewhat more difficult to stuff the national magazines with propaganda. Their standards are too high; and besides, most of their articles either come from staff reporters or are written on assignment. If the public relations counsel succeeds in hiring some one who is capable enough to write articles that national magazines will buy, he is pretty lucky. Otherwise he will have to depend on selling the magazine editors on ideas for articles, hoping that whoever is assigned to write them will have the right point of view.

This article is not intended to indict the business of public relations. Our society is run by public opinion; daily, institutions clash with institutions, and ideas with ideas, for public favor. In this war of propagandas, as the Institute has pointed out in previous letters, we all participate. What other people do poorly, the public relations counsel does well. If his methods seem rather shoddy, at times – and they do – the fault lies not so much with him as with the conditions that make those methods efficacious: the willingness of the press and radio to coöperate with the public relations counsel, the readiness of the average man or woman to get on the band wagon, the fact that we often let our biases and prejudices, rather than our minds, think for us.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES AND DISCUSSION NOTES

1. The public relations counsel can work only with the public as it is. This means with its prevalent fears and desires, hopes, ideals, and wishes. Make a list of the fears, desires, and ideals present in your group, which could be utilized by public relations counsels. Expand this list to include other people in your community. Expand it to include people in other communities.

2. There is a growing suspicion that, disguised in all kinds of forms, propaganda is being "put over" on the public. This illustrates a dilemma faced by all serious and conscientious students of propaganda. To be innocent and naïvely ignorant in the understanding of propaganda is not desirable. But it is also not desirable to be unable to enjoy a newspaper or magazine, a movie or radio program without "smelling a rat" around the corner. The uncertainty in which most of us find ourselves demands a conscious and careful effort to find a position somewhere between these two extremes. Discuss the situation, and then write a page of advice for a high school student showing him how to see the situation clearly. In other words, change uncertainty into some kind of trustworthy testing for newsreels, magazine articles, radio programs, newspaper editorials, news, and feature articles.

3. Make a thorough study of the various aspects of peace propaganda. Assign a different national peace organization to each member of the group or to committees of three or four members. The organ-

izations, their programs, plans, purposes, and propaganda should be studied carefully. Bring the reports together. Discuss the extent to which the activities of the peace organizations are propaganda, education, or both. Evaluate the effects of peace propaganda and peace education in promoting peace, without losing sight of the extent and the duration of these effects. Write a critical commentary on the value of propaganda in promoting peace.

4. Has our Federal Government any right to disseminate propaganda within the borders of the United States?[1] Such activities are paid for by taxes collected alike from citizens who agree and disagree with the Government. Is it right to use the money of those who disagree to spread propaganda which they believe is false or for a wrong purpose? Do our laws permit non-governmental groups to spread true or false propaganda about the Federal Government and its officers? Has the Federal Government the right or the obligation to spread what it believes is true propaganda about itself, its plans, purposes, and theories?

5. Consider an actual public relations campaign for, let us say, better street lights. How would you plan the program? To which groups would you appeal? What appeals would you make? Why? How would you go about getting your propaganda into the newspapers? Onto radio programs? What about word-of-mouth propaganda? Could you create that? How? Is there any way in which you could dramatize the need for better street lighting, first in order to get your propaganda into the papers, and second to crystallize public opinion? How could you impress upon your City Council the extent of the demand for better street lighting? Would committees of prominent citizens help? Delegations? Petitions? How could you arrange these? How would you finance the program?

6. Pick up your morning paper and study the stories on the front page. How did the newspaper get them? Did the newspaper send out a reporter to cover the story? If so, how did the paper know that it was going to happen? Was the story written from a "handout" (i.e., an account of the event prepared at the request of some one vitally interested in the event)? In that case, do you think it is the *whole* story? When a paper says, "It was learned . . . " or "According to reliable information . . . " just what does it mean? Obviously some one must have told the paper. Why isn't his name given?

[1] Note to Discussion Leader: In considering these questions, try to discuss them in the abstract first; it will then be easier and more fruitful to take concrete illustrations.

Volume I SEPTEMBER, 1938 *Number 12*

Propaganda: Some Illustrations

Kickback

In Washington, Robert M. LaFollette's committee on civil liberties has been putting together, piece by piece, the story of Little Steel's campaign to smash the C.I.O. From letters, and from sworn testimony, Mr. LaFollette's Senate committee has shown how Little Steel attempted to influence the press of Alabama; how it hired George E. Sokolsky, the newspaper columnist, to address huge anti-union meetings; how, with the help of the National Association of Manufacturers, it actually staged the meetings, yet managed to conceal the fact.

Little Steel's campaign, it would appear, followed the old, though still potent formula described in the Institute's last monthly letter. "Civic groups" were organized. "Names" were bought. Pamphlets and brochures were issued. The press was flooded with handouts and pictures.

In charge of some of these activities was Hill and Knowlton, the public relations firm of Cleveland and New York.

If Hill and Knowlton was in any way embarrassed by the Senate committee's revelations, the reason, perhaps, is that it neglected to practice what its senior partner, John W. Hill, so eloquently preaches. Last year, Tom M. Girdler, chairman of the board of the Republic Steel Corporation, showed the Senate Post Office Committee some photographs of "the weapons of war taken from these C.I.O. forces by the public authorities." Last month the LaFollette committee was informed that Mr. Girdler had really been showing the Senate photographs of some one's private gun collection. Mr. LaFollette's committee learned further that Mr. Girdler had gotten the photos from Hill and Knowlton.

This must have caused Hill and Knowlton to

recall, with regret, Mr. Hill's address before the Office Equipment Manufacturers' Institute at Toronto, Canada, last June. "The job of public relations," said Mr. Hill sagely, "is not for the amateur. In the first place, he is likely to exaggerate; in the second place, he so stretches his bias that it becomes an untruth.

"In public relations there is never any value in an untruth. The public will sense it sooner or later, and an unpleasant boomerang will be at work."

Mr. Sokolsky wasn't particularly flustered by the LaFollette committee's disclosure that Hill and Knowlton and the National Association of Manufacturers had paid him more than $28,000 in eighteen months to denounce the C.I.O.; but the Pittsburgh *Post-Gazette,* which runs Mr. Sokolsky's column, would just as soon that you didn't mention the whole affair. The *Post-Gazette* doesn't. In fact, it deleted all references to Mr. Sokolsky from the Associated Press story about the LaFollette committee's hearings. In this respect the *Post-Gazette* revealed a squeamishness discernible in many newspapers, for few papers identified Mr. Sokolsky with his newspaper column. This may have been due to two rather curious unwritten newspaper laws: first, that a newspaper seldom mentions another newspaper in an embarrassing editorial connection, and, second, that a journalist as a newspaper man is not "news."

Frankly, we don't know whether Republic Steel's attempt to influence the Alabama press was successful or not. We don't think anyone does. The New York *Post,* ready to believe the worst, apparently thinks that it was. At least, this is what it said last month:

PROBE REVEALS
REPUBLIC STEEL
SWAY OF PRESS

GOT "CORRECT" VIEW
OF CANTON TERROR IN
ALABAMA PAPERS

The Birmingham *Age-Herald,* on the other hand, seems just as certain that Republic's efforts were futile. Here is what the *Age-Herald* said:

VAIN ATTEMPTS TO
INFLUENCE PRESS
OF CITY CHARGED

The *Age-Herald* buttressed this headline by quoting from the letter of W. H. Oldham, in which the district manager for Republic Steel declared that his call upon Victor H. Hanson, editor of the *Age-Herald,* had not done "any good." The New York *Post* did not quote this letter, but it did quote another by Kenneth D. Mann, another official of a Republic subsidiary, which declared: "I have been successful, I believe, in changing their [the Birmingham *Post's*] editorial policy to one more favorable to us." Naturally, there was no mention of Mr. Mann's assertion in the *Age-Herald.*[1]

Headlines

As long as we are on the subject of newspaper headlines, we should like to comment on several that appeared in the papers about the Democratic primaries in Arkansas, Ohio, and Idaho last month. It has often been claimed by critics of the American press that newspapers are likely to put highly colored headlines on even the most unbiased stories; and, if some of the heads that we saw last month are representative, that is all too painfully true. In the New Deal papers, the primaries were New Deal victories; in the anti-New Deal papers, they were calamitous defeats. The Communists' *Daily Worker,* more New Deal than even the President himself, announced:

OHIO REJECTS 'TEAR GAS'
DAVEY: NEW DEAL WINS
3–1 VICTORY IN PRIMARIES

[1] EDITOR'S NOTE: A letter from Hill and Knowlton, protesting that we have misrepresented its activities in behalf of Republic Steel, was received by the Institute shortly before this volume went to press. Hill and Knowlton's protest is based primarily upon an interpretation of testimony before the LaFollette committee that differs sharply from ours. We did make one error—and we acknowledge it herewith. We should not have indicated that Hill and Knowlton helped to organize "civic groups." Actually, it was the National Association of Manufacturers which helped to form them. Hill and Knowlton, so far as can be discovered, took no part in this activity, even though it would have been quite ethical for the firm to have done so.

We have offered to print excerpts from Hill and Knowlton's letter. The firm particularly resents our interpretation of testimony by T. M. Girdler, S. Russell Gibboney, and others regarding photographs that were shown to members of the Senate Post Office Committee. We regard our interpretation as correct. If, however, we have done any injustice to Hill and Knowlton, even by implication, we sincerely wish to give the firm adequate opportunity to state its position.

The anti-New Deal Chicago *Daily Tribune:*

DEFEAT OF IDAHO
YES MAN STUNS
ROOSEVELT AIDS

The pro-New Deal Chicago *Daily Times:*

LATEST FIGURES
SHOW GAINS BY
2 NEW DEALERS

The anti-New Deal Los Angeles *Times:*

POPE'S DEFEAT
IN IDAHO JOLT
TO NEW DEAL

The pro-New Deal New York *Post:*

3 NEW DEALERS WIN

And the Washington *Daily News,* which, in keeping with the regular Scripps-Howard practice, generally damns the New Deal with faint praise:

NEW DEAL IS 1 DOWN
IN ITS SENATE PURGE

∞

Nightmare

Like all Communist papers, the *Sunday Worker* is class-angled from cover to cover. Even the comics are stuffed with propaganda. The women's page often reads like the Communist Manifesto, and there are times when the casual reader can't tell whether he is looking at the sports' column or the editorial page.

Last month, when the Hawaii Clipper plummeted into the Pacific somewhere between Guam and Manila, the *Sunday Worker* saw the class-angle right away. The *Worker* hates Japan. Ever since the war in China began, it has outdone even the Hearst press at its worst in shouting, "Yellow Peril!" So the *Worker* decided to see Nippon's fine hand in the crash of the Hawaii Clipper. Over half of page one it spread the story that, according to "a rumor" in Washington, the Clipper had been "shot down by Japanese." In support of this fantastic tale, it cited the alleged fact that Japan was jealous of "America's successful development of trans-Pacific communication."

See? That proves it.

∞

Whispers

All over the country during the past few months the story has been spreading by word of mouth: "Chesterfield gives money to Nazi Germany." Ask the rumor-mongers how they know and they will solemnly assure you that "Walter Winchell told about it the other night in his radio broadcast." Or else they will quote Boake Carter. "I heard it with my own ears," they will sometimes add.

The story is untrue. Neither Winchell nor Carter has ever said—over the air or any place else—that Chesterfield supports the Nazi régime, and there is absolutely no reason to suppose that it does. Still, the rumor continues to grow. Last month, it had reached such proportions that Liggett and Myers decided that something must be done to scotch it, and done soon. On thousands of cigar store-fronts was plastered the notice that Chesterfield would pay $25,000 reward for information concerning the source of the rumors.

How the whispering-campaign began is something that nobody knows. Liggett and Myers would like to find out because this is not the first time, and it probably will not be the last, that Chesterfield has been the victim of rumor-mongers. About four years ago, for example, the whisperers had it that lepers were employed in the Liggett and Myers factory.

Interested, the New York *World-Telegram* made an investigation of rumors, and it discovered that while many of them seem to arise spontaneously, others are deliberately created by high-pressure organizations, which have "Whispers for Sale." Many of these organizations were said to employ house-to-house canvassers, whose job it was to intersperse their sales-talk with juicy bits of gossip that housewives would be likely to repeat to their husbands, their neighbors, and friends. The cost of this service was $15 per canvasser per day.

Other groups specialized in anti-labor whispers. An employer who desired to disrupt the union in his factory would hire their men to work side by side with his regular employés. After gaining their confidence, the professional rumor-mongers would pump the workers full of slanderous tales about the union officials.

The whispering campaigns were fairly cheap, the *World-Telegram* said, and they were highly effective.

∞

"Simply Breathtaking"

Many an irate book critic has complained about the knack that some publishers seem to have for twisting even the most damning reviews into fulsome praise of their books. The critic will say: "The

author's ignorance of his subject is simply breathtaking." And two or three days later, the ads will quote him as having written: "Simply breathtaking!"

The *American Legion Monthly* did something like that last month with the New York *Herald-Tribune's* editorial on Professor William Gellermann's study of the Legion. The *Herald-Tribune's* editorial denounced the Legion for its advocacy of the bonus, charged its officials with failure to protect civil liberties, and criticized the Legion posts which support vigilante groups. In the final paragraph, however, it praised the Legion's rank and file. Surprising though it may seem, the *American Legion Monthly* cited this editorial to defend the Legion against Professor Gellermann's attack. It simply disregarded the body of the editorial, and quoted the final paragraph.

∞

Probe

One interesting fact about Representative Dies' committee on "un-American" activities is that although many individuals and groups have been labeled "fascist" or "communist," at no time has anything like a clear-cut definition of fascism or communism been given. These are the "bad" names right now. If they can be pinned on the National Labor Relations Board, the Works Progress Administration, Labor Secretary Perkins, Mr. or Mrs. Roosevelt, President MacCracken, of Vassar, or anyone of a thousand individuals or groups and if the name calling gets enough publicity, those individuals and groups are automatically discredited. That is, they are automatically discredited among people who do not seek definitions of terms. If Martin Dies had been a theologian in the Middle Ages, he should have felt at home. Anybody he didn't like he would have called a "heretic," and that would have been that.

Speaking of Name Calling, "purge" is vying with both "communist" and "fascist" as a "bad" name. Connotation: anyone from the President down who suggests that a political opponent be defeated is guilty of a "purge"; that is, guilty of being a dictator even though he practices the age old American political custom of campaigning for the defeat of opponents. "Purge" means "Hitler, Stalin, secret trials, executions." Its use ties in nicely with the use of "fascist" and "communist" at the hearings before the Special House Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities in the United States.

∞

Mutual Approval

When a university confers an honorary degree upon a person, that is a mark of the university's approval of that individual; and the person's acceptance of the degree indicates on his part approval of the university. Mutual approval thus is transferred by honorary degrees, by government decorations, by honors, medals, and citations of various sorts. Here we have propaganda acts.

A good recent example was the conferring upon Henry Ford on his seventy-fifth birthday of the award of the Grand Cross of the German Eagle, and his acceptance of same. Nazi approval of Ford and reciprocal approval of the Nazis by Ford must have been embarrassing to newspapers that have been pressing against the Nazis. Some, like the New York *Times,* made little reference to the decoration, featured instead Ford's love for the dear old McGuffey Readers.

In Detroit itself the *Free Press* gave the story of the Ford birthday celebration, before which the Nazi decoration was presented, a five-column spread on page one and more than six columns on page two. The story of the Nazi decoration got exactly two sentences at the end of all these columns. The Detroit *News* was not so shy. It featured a three-column photograph of the presentation of Hitler's birthday gift to the automobile magnate.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES AND DISCUSSION NOTES

1. It is easy to misinterpret some one's views by quoting him in a certain way. Discuss the rules the group would adopt to insure fair play in quoting speakers and writers.

2. In any acute situation on which we are likely to feel rather strongly and to take sides, we naturally wish to have precise information. A typical situation of this kind is a labor dispute or a strike. Make a list of the questions which you would like your newspaper to answer in reporting a strike. Then read half a dozen local papers when the next important strike occurs and grade them according to your list.

3. Another interesting experiment to test what one might term the "internal integrity" of a newspaper is to read a news account carefully and see if the headlines give, in your judgment, an accurate and concise statement of the most important points in the article. Compare the headlines of different papers. Do they emphasize different aspects of the same story? How widely do the stories diverge in their recountals of the same event? Have important questions about the event been left unanswered? Do you think it was possible to get these answers?

4. It is easy to accuse others of Name Calling. We forget that most of us frequently use this propaganda device ourselves. Each member of the group should carry a notebook or stiff card with him and conscientiously attempt to check himself every time he uses "good" or "bad" names by writing them down. Discuss and define these. Why do we use them?

MAY 16, 1938

SPECIAL LETTER ON

The Channels of Communication

Nightshirt

If any of the correspondents who accompanied the President to Warm Springs, Georgia, on his vacation there, had actually been in bed at 12:45 o'clock in the morning of March 31, it's just within the realm of possibility that Marvin McIntyre, the President's secretary, might have bothered to awaken them; and there would, then, have been some wisp of truth in the stories which several of them wrote about the President's letter on the reorganization bill.

However . . . they were all just as wide-awake as Times Square on New Year's Eve.

No doubt, you remember the stories: It's well after midnight. At Curtis Hall, near the President's "Little White House," the correspondents have already turned in for the night. Suddenly, in bursts Mr. McIntyre. He routs the correspondents from bed, thrusts mimeographed (or typewritten?) copies of the President's letter into their hands. Sleepy-eyed, the correspondents read: "I have no inclination to be a dictator. . . . "

The United Press told about it thus:

WARM SPRINGS, March 31 (UP).—White House attaches routed newspaper correspondents . . . from bed early today . . .

The New York *Sun:*

WARM SPRINGS, March 31.—Attaches of the White House shook newspaper correspondents into wakefulness in their beds here at 1 A. M. today . . .

The Associated Press:

. . . Correspondents, who accompanied the President to Warm Springs, were aroused . . . well after midnight . . .

The correspondents were awakened by the President himself, announced Phelps Adams, of the *Sun*. The President had to get up from bed at midnight to release the letter, said an editorial in the New York *Herald Tribune*. A phrase was born: "The President's nightshirt party."

And now for the facts:

Mr. McIntyre didn't shake any of the correspondents into wakefulness. He didn't have to, because, as we've already remarked, none of the correspondents was asleep. The President discussed the advisability of releasing the letter at dinner with his aides; he reached his decision at 8:30 p.m. or thereabouts; was in bed at 10 p.m.; and stayed in bed until the next morning. Grace Tulley, of the White House staff, and Mr. McIntyre were delayed in getting the letter ready for the press by first, the fact that Kress Hall, where the President's offices were located, is two miles from the "Little White House," and second, the lack of mimeograph machines, which made it necessary to prepare typewritten copies. Mr. McIntyre informed the correspondents of the forthcoming release between 10 and 10:30. The correspondents were all gathered in Kress Hall by 12.

In short, to quote Arthur Robb, of *Editor and Publisher:* "The so-called nightshirt party . . . was reported by some correspondents with somewhat more color than meticulous accuracy in detail. . . . The 'nightshirt' angle was a natural, and like so many newspaper naturals, it had to be achieved by avoiding inconvenient facts."

Contrast

Over UP teletypes last month clattered this story:

Copyright, 1938, the United Press

LONDON, April 24.—President Roosevelt's new "pump-priming" program will save the world temporarily from almost complete economic collapse, Sir George Paish, wartime economic adviser to the Lloyd George Cabinet, said in an interview tonight.

Until a fortnight ago, when Mr. Roosevelt began divulging his plans for new government spending, lending, and credit, Sir George said, "I feared a world economic breakdown late this spring. Now the outlook for at least a year has changed . . ."

Among the clients of the United Press is the Providence *Journal,* militant New Deal critic. Deftly, the *Journal* switched the quotes around, shifted the eleventh paragraph into the lead, made some other changes. Here is how it finally ran the story:

SEES RECOVERY BY SPENDING ONLY AS LONG AS CASH LASTS

SIR GEORGE PAISH CRITICIZES U. S. PLAN

DECLARES BUILDING BOOM WOULD RESULT IN MORE LASTING BENEFITS

LONDON, April 24 (UP) — A recovery policy based upon the expenditure of money can be successful in itself only as long as the money holds out, Sir George Paish, wartime economic adviser to the Lloyd George Cabinet, declared tonight. . . .

Protest

On the Hearst papers it's the incompetent reporter, indeed, who cannot arouse public opinion to fever pitch at twenty minutes notice, and with only the help of the nearest telephone book. The reporter has merely to call ten or twelve people, who, he knows, are sure to agree with the current Hearst campaign; ask them please to agree for publication; and there he is. Within two hours, his paper will announce: PUBLIC DECRIES . . . PATRIOTIC LEADERS CLAMOR. . . .

If his editor wants to convert the clamor into action, the reporter's job is somewhat more difficult. He will have to attend meetings of the local American Legion, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and similar groups; and get their officials to introduce resolutions. He may even have to write the resolutions himself. He may also have to write bills, induce legislators to propose them, lobby for their passage at the state capitol.

In New York City, two months ago, reporters for the *Journal and American* succeeded beyond their most fervid hopes in prodding the public to protest against the appointment of Simon Gerson, Communist newspaperman, as special assistant to Stanley Isaacs, president of the Borough of Manhattan. Even liberal groups, which almost invariably are opposed to Hearst policies and Hearst crusades, joined the clamor against Gerson. Even the New York *Post,* which has baited Hearst as energetically as Hearst baits the Communists.

Last month, in Boston, Hearst reporters again were quivering with fear of the "red menace." Unlike their New York colleagues, however, they found but few to quiver with them. Granville Hicks, former editor of the Communist *New Masses,* had been asked to join the staff of Harvard College as fellow in American History. In the city room of the Boston *American* reporters leaped to 'phones. Twenty members of the Grand Army of the Republic protested. The Watertown lodge of the Elks protested. Daniel J. Doherty, National Commander of the American Legion, protested. The *American* said that Robert S. Hillyer, Pulitzer Prize winner, had protested too; but Mr. Hillyer denied it.

Undergraduates, bustling across the Harvard Yard on their way to class, were stopped by *American* reporters, and urged to sign petitions against Hicks. Few did, but the *American* nevertheless reported: STUDENTS REVOLT ON RED PROFESSOR. When even the Young Conservatives, the most right-wing student group at the university, announced their approval of Hicks' appointment, the *American* just gave up.

TaxCENTinels

One day last month in Troy, N. Y., students of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, by wandering from shop to shop, from bank to bank, managed to collect 250,000 pennies in less than eight hours. This was half of the city's normal supply; and by nightfall pennies were scarce in Troy, and business was badly hobbled. Grocers used postage stamps to make change; other business men were forced to adjust their odd-cent prices.

To New York newspapermen, who dashed

over from Albany to cover the story, Robert G. Baumann, president of the Student Union, explained that his purpose in organizing the penny-raid was to protest against "hidden taxes." He announced the formation of the TaxCENTinels "to help fight the growth of taxes, which now consume 25 cents out of every dollar spent by the average person . . . [by paying] one-quarter of the price of all purchases in pennies in order to dramatize this situation. . . . " With their hoarded pennies, undergraduates at once proceeded to carry out this program, and Troy business men had another bad day.

Commented Dr. William Otis Hotchkiss, president of Rensselaer: "A sure sign of spring. . . ."

The stunt was less a sign of spring, however, than of the efficiency of the Carl Byoir organization. Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc. is probably the biggest, and certainly the most active public relations organization in the country. Among its clients are the Republic of China, the city of Miami, the Aluminum Company of America, the Freeport Sulphur Company.

While Troy shopkeepers were frantically scratching around for pennies, John Dougherty, of the Carl Byoir organization, sat in his room at the Hendrick Hudson Hotel, banging out newspaper releases and feature stories about their plight. Cornering him there, George L. Cassidy, of the New York *Post* asked Mr. Dougherty what he was doing so far away from home, and how come he was helping to publicize the TaxCENTinels. Mr. Dougherty explained: he was in the neighborhood, and decided to call on Mr. Baumann; talking about the Veterans of Foreign Wars, they happened to evolve the idea of the penny-raid; since he was partly responsible for the idea, he thought it only right that he do his share in carrying it out.

Mr. Dougherty was less than frank. Actually, the idea was evolved right in his office as part of the campaign against discriminatory chain store legislation, which Carl Byoir & Associates has undertaken for some of its clients. Public sentiment against the chain stores is so great that it would probably be worse than futile to attack such legislation directly. On the other hand, anti-chain store measures are generally tax measures, designed to increase the chain store's overhead, and, thereby, make it difficult, if not impossible, for it to undersell the independent dealer. If the public could be made to feel that *all* taxes which raise prices are undesirable, it might be less inclined to levy special taxes against the chain stores — and thus remove the greatest menace to their continued prosperity.

That is the strategy of the Carl Byoir campaign; and this is what brought John Dougherty to Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. At present, Byoir is planning another organization against "hidden taxes." It will not be temporary, as was the TaxCENTinels, but permanent; not local, but nation-wide. It will attempt to gain the support of all consumers.

And it will arise "spontaneously."

Fair Enough?

Atop its editorial page the New York *World-Telegram* carries the Scripps-Howard motto: "Give Light, and the People Will Find Their Own Way." At the bottom of the page generally runs columnist Raymond Clapper's daily Washington dispatch. One day last month, snapping at critics of the reorganization bill, Mr. Clapper asked: "Why All the Shouting?" Among the critics of the bill was the *World-Telegram*. Motto to the contrary, the *World-Telegram* did not print Mr. Clapper's dispatch that day.

Nor did the *World-Telegram* print Westbrook Pegler's column on the Spanish civil war. Mr. Pegler had written: "I cannot see why the working-class Catholics are expected to be indignant against the government side in Spain. I think their indignation should be directed against those members of the Spanish clergy and the well born Spaniards of the Catholic faith who neglected a duty that was placed upon them. To them, originally, rather than to the mobs which raged in the early days of the war, I would charge the blame for the slaughter of priests and nuns." Among the papers which buy Mr. Pegler's column the *World-Telegram* was hardly alone in feeling that it would not be politic to print this particular article. *The New Republic* (May 11, 1938) printed this article under the caption "Fair Enough" — the title of Mr. Pegler's syndicated column.

Advts.

Our faith in advertising was undermined again last month. Not that we question the sincerity of those who lend their names to advertised products; but occasionally we come across some-

thing in the magazines that just makes us wonder.

It was perplexing to read the interview with Marion Talley in the New York *Herald Tribune,* in which the famous opera star declared that she had taken off so much weight by going for long walks around Manhattan Island. We had always understood that Ry-Krisp was responsible.

Nor can we understand how it happens that Dolores Del Rio, the movie star, has given testimonials both to Camels and to Lucky Strikes.

And who *really* know tobacco best, the auctioneers, buyers, and warehousemen, who smoke Luckies, or the tobacco planters who smoke Camels?

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES AND DISCUSSION NOTES

1. Is enforcement of political party loyalty, with threat of reprisals, a form of propaganda? Does it limit freedom of speech and assembly of United States citizens?

2. Do Government officials who are party to this enforcement abuse their rights? Does the example of such enforcement tend to intimidate heads of businesses dependent in one form or another upon Government coöperation? Do non-governmental organizations (e.g., schools and colleges, pressure groups, patriotic societies, professional and business associations, industries) enforce similar loyalty in the areas of their greatest interests?

3. Is secrecy vital in the early stages of arriving at international agreements? Can publicity harm unfinished negotiations? In this respect what are the differences between democratic and dictatorial governments in obligations toward the people?

4. Would public ownership of newspapers be any more dangerous than public ownership of the post-office? Discuss the implications and ramifications of this question.

5. Discuss the obligations of newspaper publishers when they are guaranteed freedom of the press. Be specific.

6. How much are you influenced by the advertising statements of manufacturers? Do many manufacturers deliberately try to mislead the public? How can people inform themselves better about their purchases?

JUNE 16, 1938

SPECIAL LETTER ON

The Channels of Communication

Hague

The Jersey City *Journal* likes to refer to Congressman Jerry O'Connell as "dear Jerry." Captions tell how "'Dear Jerry' Meets John Law." Headlines sneer that "Scared 'Dear Jerry' Later Turns 'Brave.'" The *Journal* demands that Mr. O'Connell stay in Washington and mind his own business. Its political columnist, D. John Rickard, calls him "the whoopee-doop congressman from the reed regions."

The *Journal* is anything but friendly toward "whoopee-doop congressmen." Nor does it care much for "nit-wit professors from hunky-dunk colleges," who clamor for "so-called 'freedom of speech.'" Mr. Rickard likens them, in his more restrained moments, to animals "frothing with hydrophobia." Mr. Rickard complains: "These mad and vicious creatures snarl and growl and strive to bite us."

Back in the days when Mayor Frank Hague was first consolidating his power, the *Journal* could be just as critical of him as the rest of the nation's press is now. It charged him with stealing city funds. It asked: "How did Hague get his money? Where did he get it? How can he buy a palace at Deal on $8,000 a year?" But Hague, like every dictator, couldn't stand for opposition from the press. He decided to kick the *Journal* into subservience. He announced that any city or county employee who read the *Journal* would be dismissed at once. Police and firemen were ordered to distribute from door to door leaflets denouncing the *Journal* as "selfish and dishonest." They were also ordered to subscribe to an opposition paper, more friendly to Hague, and to obtain other subscriptions.

Advertisers were asked to boycott the *Journal.* Most of them did. One movie exhibitor

who refused was suddenly overwhelmed by police, fire, health, and building inspectors. They nailed dozens of violation notices on his theatre, and finally told him to close it.

Nowadays, the *Journal* says that Mayor Frank Hague is "the red-blooded leader of red-blooded Americans," that "his whole political career is built upon public confidence in his unyielding opposition to every lawless element." Hague is the law in Jersey City. And that's all right as far as the *Journal* is concerned.

Hague seems to keep the support of the Jersey City press just as he keeps his political machine together — by patronage. Mr. Rickard, for example, has profited greatly from his loyalty to Hague. Several of his relatives are on the Jersey City payroll. His wife, mother of five children, recently was appointed "confidential investigator" for Hudson County judges. Her salary will be $3,500 a year. And Mr. Rickard, himself, is doing Frank Hague's publicity in his spare time.

It's commonplace in Jersey City for newspapermen to get their wives and relatives on the city payroll; and some newspapermen, in fact, are even on the payroll themselves. As far back as 1929, the Case Legislative Committee discovered that one reporter was drawing pay from the city as "utility man," while another was getting his as "a laborer." A managing editor doubles as state librarian at $5,000 a year. According to David G. Wittels, of the New York *Post,* reporters who cover the courts are occasionally given receiverships to keep them happy.

Although President Roosevelt has said that Hague is merely a local issue, the Hague régime has, nevertheless, become page-one news throughout the country and the problem of keeping the press under control has grown more troublesome. Philadelphia and New York newspapers circulate in Jersey City, and their sales are mounting steadily. Unfortunately for Hague, it seems impossible for him to intimidate them as he did the local papers.

Not that he doesn't try. Charles Zerner, the Jersey City reporter for the New York *Times,* is barred from many city offices. His automobile has been tampered with. One night a squad of men attempted to break into his apartment. Several months ago, Police Chief Harry Walsh called on the editors of his paper to demand that he be fired.

Similarly, the New York *Post* last month discovered that policemen had told more than two hundred Jersey City newsdealers to remove the paper from their stands. The *Post* immediately went into Federal Court to ask for an injunction. "I'm not going to make any speeches about the freedom of the press, although that issue is clearly involved here," said Federal Judge William Clark, in granting the request.

S

Quotes

It now seems that despite the best efforts of the Columbia Press Service, which supplies newspapers with special feature stories from Washington, D. C., the Seattle *Star's* four-point recovery program will find it necessary to get along without the support of Harold G. Moulton, head of the Brookings Institution. Nor can it count on much help — in the near future, at least — from Arthur Capper, Gerald P. Nye, Lewis B. Schwellenbach, and Homer Bone. Some of the Senators, in fact, don't feel the least bit sympathetic toward either the *Star* or its program these days. As for the Columbia Press Service, it had better watch its step or Senator Schwellenbach will make another speech.

Nobody can accuse the Columbia Press Service of not having tried. No sooner had the *Star* announced, "Business Dying; Here's the Way to Save It," when back came the Columbia Press Service with the report that Dr. Moulton and the four Senators were in favor of its plan. A new tax law, in which it would be provided that no changes might be made during the next five years; abandonment of the New Deal's power development program; stabilization of the dollar; amendment of the Wagner Act — these were the points of the *Star's* recovery plan. The Columbia Press Service reported, and the *Star* duly printed that Dr. Moulton had said of them: "99 per cent of the American people still want a nation free of the hardship of totalitarianism," and I, therefore, "congratulate the *Star* on its program." Senator Nye was quoted: "I know of no better way to bring this [domestic and industrial peace] about than to adopt the principle outlined in the Seattle *Star.*" The others were said to have been similarly impressed.

Unfortunately, the Columbia Press Service had never bothered to interview either Dr. Moulton or the four Senators; and, when the latter were shown the *Star's* glowing story, they nearly blew up. Senators Nye and Capper in-

formed Senator Schwellenbach that so far as they knew they had never read the four-point program; and Senator Schwellenbach informed the Senate: "I not only never heard of the *Star's* four-point program, but I never heard of the Seattle *Star.*"

And the Senator asserted that it seemed as if ". . . the newspaper profession of this country has reached its lowest ebb."

Immediately, Prescott Dennett, head of the Columbia Press Service, apologized profusely. "A new employee" was responsible for the phoney quotes, he said. The Seattle *Star,* he said, was entirely blameless: It had printed the story in good faith.

Czar

The nation's radio broadcasters are suffering at present from an exceptionally bad case of nerves. In Washington things have been going rather badly for them. Government officials and members of Congress on several occasions have taken pot-shots at some of the programs that now fill the ether. All sorts of bills to investigate, tax, and regulate the industry have been discussed.

If public opinion were to sour on the industry, some of these bills might pass. So the nation's broadcasters have been taking steps, of late, to keep on the public's good side. When, for example, the clamor arose over Mae West's "Garden of Eden" program, so jittery did N.B.C. officials become that Edward L. Bernays was called in and hired as public relations consultant.

Similarly, the National Association of Broadcasters has just taken on three new publicity men: Edward M. Kirby, to advise on public relations; Paul F. Peter, for research and statistics; and Joseph L. Miller, for straight publicity, with special emphasis on labor.

In addition, the N.A.B. has completely revamped its constitution. Heretofore, the presidency of the N.A.B. has been an honorary post, filled by a member of the association, who served only part-time, and without pay. Under the new set-up, the president is given far greater powers, will serve full-time, and will receive $25,000 annually.

Neville Miller, former Mayor of Louisville, Kentucky, is expected to receive the appointment. As "czar" of the broadcasting industry, he will be asked to put its house in order, and to embark upon what the magazine *Broadcasting* calls "an open fight against the enemies of radio."

Labor

Once Dave Beck was Seattle's bogeyman. The Seattle *Post-Intelligencer* seldom missed an opportunity to sputter its disapproval of him; and sometimes, as when he ordered his burly teamsters onto the picket line, which the American Newspaper Guild had thrown about the *Post-Intelligencer* building, it almost choked with rage. But things are different now. Today, as West Coast leader of the American Federation of Labor, Beck is fighting to save the business men of Seattle from "Harry Bridges, the C. I. O., and revolution." And if the Guild thinks less of him since it has left the A. F. of L. to join the C. I. O., the *Post-Intelligencer* thinks more, lots more.

So the *Post-Intelligencer* was anything but pleased by Westbrook Pegler's recent series on Dave Beck and the West Coast labor movement. One column, "Fascism in America," in which Mr. Pegler told how Beck coöperates with business at the expense of the consumer and described his manipulations in the beer industry, was omitted entirely. Another, "Boss Beck," was heavily blue-pencilled. Apparently the *Post-Intelligencer* didn't think its readers should know about Beck's elegant hotel suite, his salary—$12,500 a year and expenses—his boast that "I have operated every brewery up here for three years." Mr. Pegler's comparison between Dave Beck's domination of Seattle business and Capone's old rackets also was deleted, as were his references to Beck's "arm-and-leg breaking." To quote Walter Winchell, Hearst columnist, whose copy has likewise been cut, of late: "The boss lets his paragrapher jot down anything that comes into his noodle. The boss can always throw the column away. Hey, Westbrook?"

Bias

America's bias contest is over; and to A. H. McDonald, of Tenafly, N. J., has gone the first prize of $25. Mr. McDonald clipped from the Bergen (N. J.) *Evening Record* an involved and rather impassioned letter, reprinted in *America* for April 23, which expressed the view that Jesus Christ was probably the illegitimate son of Mary by some Roman soldier. It was, the judges felt, by far

the most odious example of anti-Catholic bias that has recently appeared in the American press.

America's purpose in holding the contest was to drive home to its readers the extent of anti-Catholic propaganda in the press; and this it did, at least in the mind of the Rev. John A. Toomey, S. J., associate editor. According to Father Toomey the contest drove home another phenomenon: the way in which the American press, "from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Gulf to the Canadian border, is falsifying the situation in Spain."

To remedy this, *America* wants Catholic organizations to combine their forces and bear down on newspapers and magazines to prevent the publication of anti-Catholic or pro-Loyalist articles. In New York City the press committees of eighteen Catholic societies have already, to quote Father Toomey, "effected a united Catholic front in the press and magazine field," and similar movements are underway elsewhere. Such consolidation, says Father Toomey, will increase the power of Catholics to influence the press because editors don't mind "having little dogs snap at their heels," but very few would like to have "lions getting cross with them."

"Facts of Life"

Of New York's eight major newspapers, two — J. David Stern's *Evening Post* and J. M. Patterson's *Daily News* — are boisterously pro-New Deal. The others range from approval of the President's milder policies to apoplectic condemnation of his every word. The New Deal papers battle for New Deal measures with their news as well as with their editorial columns. And make no bones about it. At the same time, however, they charge that other newspapers are equally biased in their presentation of the news, if not more so—though, of course, in the opposite direction.

On several occasions both the *Post* and the *Daily News* have attempted to prove their charge of prejudice by getting down to cases. The *Daily News* chortles at the New York *Times* for putting G. O. P. condemnation of increased expenditures for W. P. A. on page one, while reserving the last page in the paper for Cleveland's relief breakdown. "Wishful thinking," laughs the *News*. Again, it calls on the *World-Telegram* to stop playing up the Gerson affair, referring to Simon W. Gerson as "New York's one-man red menace." The *World-Telegram* is boring its readers to death, says the *News*. What is worse, it's giving those Communists too much publicity.

And, while the *Daily News* barks playfully at the rest of the New York press, the *Post* snaps at their heels and bites. One day last month, it exploded: "Add Facts of Life — News Unfit to Print." It charged the New York *Times,* which prides itself on its complete impartiality in its news columns, with burying the news of Supreme Court decisions in favor of the New Deal, while overplaying the unfavorable verdicts. Said the *Post:* What happened in the Court on May 23 was handled by the *Times* as though it "were playing hide-the-slipper." The Court's refusal to permit three South Carolina utility companies to appeal from a lower court decision was nowhere in the paper; neither was mention of Chief Justice Hughes' tart questioning of counsel for Republic Steel. Three decisions in favor of the National Labor Relations Board were hidden in the fifth paragraph of a story on page six; Hughes' rebuke of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals was pushed back into page 33.

"Would it have been *indelicate* to let the readers of the *Times* know what really happened?" asked the *Post.*

Next day the *Post* erupted again with "The Facts of Life for Newspaper Readers: No. 3." A press release had been sent out by *Fortune,* the magazine of business, on its quarterly poll of public opinion, which had shown that President Roosevelt's popularity was nearly as great as ever. Coupled with this was an editorial, in which *Fortune* denounced business for its opposition to social reform.

The *Herald Tribune,* despite its thoroughgoing disapproval of the President, ran the results of the poll, although it made no mention of the editorial. The *World-Telegram* ran both the editorial and the poll. The story was ignored, however, by the *Journal and American,* the *Sun,* and the New York *Times.* This caused the *Post* to declare:

> When an important story from a major source is omitted and readers are kept in ignorance of a significant pro-Roosevelt poll, are kept in the dark about our leading business magazine's rebuke to business, it is time for a checkup.

have been careful to avoid the controversial, fearing to antagonize their fellow producers, the Hays office, State censors, political, civic, and religious groups, and foreign nations. Pictures that deal with sociological themes have been made before, of course, but seldom have there been pictures to provoke such conflict.

Only last month, Samuel Goldwyn announced that he was abandoning his plan to produce *The Exiles,* an original story by Vera Caspary and George Sklar, which tells of the flight of Jewish artists, scientists, and writers to America, to escape persecution in their native Germany. Other pro[illegible]rs had brought pressure to bear on Mr. Goldwyn; the Hays office had refused to approve the script unless it was drastically revised; and there had been rumors that Germany would not only ban the picture itself, but would seek to induce other nations to ban it, too.

Paths of Glory, Humphrey Cobb's best-selling novel of the French general who slaughtered his own troops, has been shunted around the Paramount office for nearly two years. Paramount at one time had ambitious plans for its production; but France protested, and so the plans were shelved.

Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer owns the motion picture rights to Franz Werfel's *The Forty Days of Musa Dagh,* an exciting and dramatic story of the slaughter of embattled Armenian villagers during the World War. In the face of protests by the French and Turkish governments, however, Metro has been rather hesitant to make it.

Metro also owns *It Can't Happen Here,* by Sinclair Lewis. It has never produced it because of pressure from the Hays office, which also caused the abandonment of plans to produce Karl Kapek's satire on the machine age, *R. U. R.,* and Sergei Eisenstein's version of Theodore Dreiser's *American Tragedy.*

Blockade, whatever its artistic merits, is, therefore, an unusual picture — Hollywood's first excursion into the field of political and religious controversy. Whether other producers will follow Mr. Wanger's lead is said to depend upon *Blockade's* financial success. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer is holding up the production of *Idiot's Delight* to see whether *Blockade* does well at the box-office, for, says *Variety,* although the stories "bear no similarity in plot, they do in theme, and if *Blockade* can successfully clear the obstacles of international distribution, then *Idiot's Delight,* more potently charged with personalities, is likely to touch satisfactory income figures."

Similarly, Mr. Wanger has temporarily postponed the shooting of Vincent Sheean's *Personal History,* which has been adapted for the movies by John Howard Lawson and Budd Schulberg. United Artists, the company which distributes Mr. Wanger's productions, has induced him to wait for the reaction to *Blockade* first.

∽

Stunt One fine day last month, eight once opulent motion picture stars, now forced to work as extras for Selznick-International, petitioned Governor Merriam, of California, to protect future stars from throwing away their money as they had. They suggested that 10 per cent of every movie player's salary be held for him by the State, to safeguard against the rainy day that would come when his popularity had begun to decline.

Hollywood correspondents pounced upon the story; and newspapers played it big, from coast to coast — with pictures, interviews, and autobiographies. Editorial writers gurgled with pity or seethed with indignation over the plight of the former stars, and Governor Merriam announced, quite solemnly, that he would give the suggestion his most serious consideration.

All of which must have greatly pleased Russell Birdwell, who is the director of publicity for Selznick-International. It was he who thought up the whole idea. The ex-movie stars, who petitioned the Governor, were just playing another part, one that Mr. Birdwell's staff had written for them.

∽

Lie-factory About fifteen years ago Riga was probably our most fertile source of news about the Soviet Union, more fertile, by far, than even Moscow, itself. The capital of Latvia was packed with refugees; and more kept pouring in, bringing with them hair-raising tales of the Soviet terror — of murder, arson, civil war, and banditry. So American newspapers and press associations kept crack men at Riga; and, daily, American newspaper readers gaped with horror at the headlines and wondered how such things could be.

After the dispatches from Riga had told of

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES AND DISCUSSION NOTES

1. It is generally recognized among informed people that the theories of Father Coughlin, Huey Long, and Dr. Townsend indicate an ignorance or lack of recognition of many economic facts and laws. Yet these men were successful public speakers and had immense followings. Similarly, Hitler's economic and racial theories are far removed from those generally accepted by thoughtful students of the subjects. Discuss the following questions and ask a member of the group to write a brief report of the discussion: Does a leader need to be informed? How much ignorance will the public stand? Do crowds prefer promises to facts? What do we mean when we say that democracy depends upon education?

2. Attend a public meeting or listen to a radio discussion. Follow the opinions and arguments carfully. Immediately afterwards go off by yourself and consider these questions: What precisely is the conflict of interest or faith involved in the disagreement? Of what is each side afraid? How much is real and how much is imagined danger? Note your answers. Discuss them at your next group meeting. Then inject into the discussion a clear definition of the conflicting dangers. Observe the results.

3. Attend a meeting or listen to a speech over the radio. Ask another member of the group not to hear it but to read it. Discuss your interpretations of the speech. This may reveal much about innuendo.

4. Make a survey of race attitudes among the members of your group. Then read Bruno Lasker's *Race Attitudes in Children* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1929). How many of the members of the group are against or fearful of Negroes, Japanese, Germans, Jews, Catholics? How many think the white race is superior in every way? Discuss the origin of these attitudes giving attention to one's background, geographical location, schooling, reading, religious beliefs, etc. How can we develop a more tolerant attitude toward people of different race, religion, political and economic beliefs?

JULY 16, 1938

SPECIAL LETTER ON

The Channels of Communication

Still-Born

It may very well be true, as Walter Wanger has so earnestly declared, that *Blockade,* his sermon against the slaughter of non-combatants in the Spanish civil war, never was intended as pro-Loyalist propaganda; but those in this country who sympathize either with the Loyalists or with the Insurgents will hardly be convinced of that. Mr. Wanger approached his theme as gingerly as though it threatened suddenly to explode in his face; and there is nothing in the picture itself to identify the locale or the opposing armies. Day after day, however, the headlines tell of the bombing of Loyalist cities, the blockade of Loyalist ports. And they are identification enough.

Not since *The Birth of a Nation* has any picture created so much controversy as *Blockade.* No sooner did it open than Joseph Lamb, deputy of the New York Council, Knights of Columbus, denounced the movie as "subtle pro-Loyalist propaganda." The Board of Directors of the K. of C., meeting in New Haven, called it "historically false and intellectually dishonest." *The Catholic News* predicted that it would "stir up prejudice, bad feeling, and contention." *The Brooklyn Tablet* demanded: "Blockade 'Blockade'!"

Naturally, Loyalist sympathizers have defended the picture as vigorously as partisans of General Franco have denounced it. The *Nation,* the *New Masses,* the *American Guardian,* and other liberal and left-wing publications have urged their readers to crown *Blockade* with "the laurel that Hollywood and Will Hays recognize: box-office success." A similar plea has been made by the Associated Film Audiences. In England, where *Blockade* shattered the house record at the London Pavilion, leaflets praising the movie have been distributed by the Spanish Defendents' Aid Committee. In the autumn, when the picture gets its general British release, the Trades Union Council plans to call upon its millions of members to see it.

According to reports, Hollywood is following the controversy over *Blockade* with more than usual interest. Heretofore, the producers

have been careful to avoid the controversial, fearing to antagonize their fellow producers, the Hays office, State censors, political, civic, and religious groups, and foreign nations. Pictures that deal with sociological themes have been made before, of course, but seldom have there been pictures to provoke such conflict.

Only last month, Samuel Goldwyn announced that he was abandoning his plan to produce *The Exiles,* an original story by Vera Caspary and George Sklar, which tells of the flight of Jewish artists, scientists, and writers to America, to escape persecution in their native Germany. Other producers had brought pressure to bear on Mr. Goldwyn; the Hays office had refused to approve the script unless it was drastically revised; and there had been rumors that Germany would not only ban the picture itself, but would seek to induce other nations to ban it, too.

Paths of Glory, Humphrey Cobb's best-selling novel of the French general who slaughtered his own troops, has been shunted around the Paramount office for nearly two years. Paramount at one time had ambitious plans for its production; but France protested, and so the plans were shelved.

Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer owns the motion picture rights to Franz Werfel's *The Forty Days of Musa Dagh,* an exciting and dramatic story of the slaughter of embattled Armenian villagers during the World War. In the face of protests by the French and Turkish governments, however, Metro has been rather hesitant to make it.

Metro also owns *It Can't Happen Here,* by Sinclair Lewis. It has never produced it because of pressure from the Hays office, which also caused the abandonment of plans to produce Karl Kapek's satire on the machine age, *R. U. R.,* and Sergei Eisenstein's version of Theodore Dreiser's *American Tragedy.*

Blockade, whatever its artistic merits, is, therefore, an unusual picture – Hollywood's first excursion into the field of political and religious controversy. Whether other producers will follow Mr. Wanger's lead is said to depend upon *Blockade's* financial success. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer is holding up the production of *Idiot's Delight* to see whether *Blockade* does well at the box-office, for, says *Variety,* although the stories "bear no similarity in plot, they do in theme, and if *Blockade* can successfully clear the obstacles of international distribution, then *Idiot's Delight,* more potently charged with personalities, is likely to touch satisfactory income figures."

Similarly, Mr. Wanger has temporarily postponed the shooting of Vincent Sheean's *Personal History,* which has been adapted for the movies by John Howard Lawson and Budd Schulberg. United Artists, the company which distributes Mr. Wanger's productions, has induced him to wait for the reaction to *Blockade* first.

∞

Stunt One fine day last month, eight once opulent motion picture stars, now forced to work as extras for Selznick-International, petitioned Governor Merriam, of California, to protect future stars from throwing away their money as they had. They suggested that 10 per cent of every movie player's salary be held for him by the State, to safeguard against the rainy day that would come when his popularity had begun to decline.

Hollywood correspondents pounced upon the story; and newspapers played it big, from coast to coast – with pictures, interviews, and autobiographies. Editorial writers gurgled with pity or seethed with indignation over the plight of the former stars, and Governor Merriam announced, quite solemnly, that he would give the suggestion his most serious consideration.

All of which must have greatly pleased Russell Birdwell, who is the director of publicity for Selznick-International. It was he who thought up the whole idea. The ex-movie stars, who petitioned the Governor, were just playing another part, one that Mr. Birdwell's staff had written for them.

∞

Lie-factory About fifteen years ago Riga was probably our most fertile source of news about the Soviet Union, more fertile, by far, than even Moscow, itself. The capital of Latvia was packed with refugees; and more kept pouring in, bringing with them hair-raising tales of the Soviet terror – of murder, arson, civil war, and banditry. So American newspapers and press associations kept crack men at Riga; and, daily, American newspaper readers gaped with horror at the headlines and wondered how such things could be.

After the dispatches from Riga had told of

the collapse of the Soviet dictatorship, the destruction of Moscow, and the victory of the White Armies for the sixth or seventh time, however, American newspaper editors began to suspect that Riga, while undoubtedly their most prolific source of Soviet news, was probably not their most reliable. They began to call it "the Riga lie-factory," and they ordered their correspondents to Moscow.

Of all the great news-gathering agencies, only two — *The Times,* of London, and the Chicago Tribune-N. Y. News Syndicate Co., Inc. — still keep top-notch men at Riga, still rely upon it for their Soviet news. Last month, the Chicago *Tribune* correspondent, Donald Day, had this story to report: Workers in the Josef Stalin Automobile Works had risen in revolt against the Soviet régime; after demolishing the machines, and setting the factory afire, they had erected barricades and fought a pitched battle with members of the Moscow Fire Department and the G. P. U.; an undetermined number had been killed, and 3,000 were under arrest.

As far as the Institute has been able to determine, few American news editors bothered to ask their Moscow correspondents to check Mr. Day's story. One, who did, received the laconic reply: "Huh?"

∽

Legion While the National Education Association was meeting in New York last month, Professor William Gellermann's thesis, *The American Legion as Educator,* was published by the Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University. It was immediately charged that some one at Teachers College wanted to embarrass the N. E. A. by giving newspaper readers the impression that the N. E. A. was in some way responsible for Professor Gellermann's study. On the contrary, the New York *Times'* page-one story about the dissertation appeared on the opening day of the educators' convention simply because the books went on sale that day. Teachers College had expected that the books would be ready for sale as early as May 15; but delays at the bindery made delivery coincide with the opening of the convention. The coincidence was not premeditated; it was sheer accident.

Actually Dr. Gellermann finished his thesis last summer. At that time New York reporters were told about the story. A New York *Post* reporter was asked to write the story. After the assistant city editor had discussed the study with the managing editor, however, the order was countermanded.

Also, the New York *Times* and *Herald Tribune* correspondents saw hot news in Gellermann's study and told their superiors about it. But no story appeared in either paper.

Still later, another *Post* reporter brought the study to his city editor's attention. It was killed again. Still no story.

Finally, in May, 1938, Professor Gellermann's thesis was announced for publication, and reporters were informed that it would be publicized in the routine manner on publication date.

It was only by coincidence that Professor Gellermann's book came from the printers when it did. A *Times* reporter wrote two columns about it at the request of his editors. The *Times,* previously cold to Gellermann's study, now decided to play it on page one.

The next day the *Times* attacked the study. The *Post* and the *Herald Tribune,* which had ignored the study in their news columns, praised it loudly.

Thus far, the controversy over the Gellermann analysis of the Legion has taken chiefly the form of name calling. Few of those who have attacked Professor Gellermann bothered to read his book or answer his specific charges. They have shouted; "Crackpot, red, Communist, un-American, libel, Moscow, jackass, puny mind, fly-speck." Of course, Professor Gellermann was guilty of name calling himself when he spoke of the Legion as being "potentially fascist" and linked it with such organizations as the Black Legion. However, as Professor Gellermann later pointed out in a letter to the *Times,* his conclusions were based upon long research and "factual evidence."

Dr. Gellermann's letter to the *Times,* incidentally, was probably responsible for Ralph Thompson's highly favorable book review which appeared in the same issue.

∽

Tit for Tat "Oil and 'the More Abundant Life' . . . an Epic for America's Newspaper Readers."

Under this streamer last month eighteen newspaper publishers, including Frank E. Gannett, of the powerful Gannett chain, and J. Noel Macy, of the Westchester Newspapers, seven influential dailies in New York's opulent

Westchester County, told readers of *Editor and Publisher* the story of the petroleum industry — as the petroleum industry prefers to have it told:

Nearly fourteen billion dollars have been invested by two million Americans in the petroleum industry. One million employés receive $1,500,000,000 in wages from it every year; eleven million workers are dependent upon it, either directly or indirectly, for their living. Direct taxes on gasoline alone totaled $964,000,000 in 1937.

Mr. Gannett and his fellow-publishers presented their rosy picture in two pages of paid advertising, splattered with photos of battleships, tractors, airplanes, streamlined locomotives, oil wells, and trucks. And they concluded: "Every citizen . . . should be acquainted with all of the facts of this great industry upon which his maximum earning power, the health and education of his family, present and future comforts and pleasures, as well as safety in time of war, are so dependent."

The petroleum industry, they said, is "one to foster and protect for the good of all America." No citizen, once he knew the facts, could fail to realize that.

Anyone who might have wondered at the action of the publishers in buying two pages of *Editor and Publisher* to proclaim their reverence for the petroleum industry would have found the answer to his bewilderment in the final paragraph of the ad. The publishers, he would have learned, were inviting American industry to place institutional advertising in their papers — advertising that would present industry's point of view on the economic problems that now face the nation.

It need hardly be said that any industrialist would hesitate to put such ads in newspapers that were giving their readers another picture of American industry than his. So the publishers had decided to assure the industrialist that he needn't worry: they realized no less fully than he, "what can be accomplished by individual enterprise, under the American system [ah! Glittering Generality!], in the satisfaction of human needs."

The newspapers, which are so eager to present industry's story, include the Boston *Globe,* Chicago *Tribune,* Cincinnati *Enquirer,* Cleveland *Press,* Columbus *Dispatch,* Fall River *Herald News,* Gannett Newspapers, Harrisburg *Patriot & News,* Johnstown *Democrat,* Johnstown *Tribune,* Louisville *Courier-Journal,* Louisville *Times,* New York *Sun,* Pittsburgh *Press,* Scranton *Times,* Washington *Star,* Westchester Newspapers, and Youngstown *Vindicator.*

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES AND DISCUSSION NOTES

1. In a civilization as complex and as fraught with conflicting propagandas and theories as ours, we frequently forget the cathartic value of laughter, particularly of laughter at ourselves, at our strong prejudices, theories, and assumptions, at their illogic and inconsistencies. An interesting experiment is to see what drama and laughter can do to propaganda. Study cartoons, editorials, letters, speeches, and other forms of the most extreme expressions of violent partisanship in such conflicts as those between the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O., capital and labor, democratic and dictatorial nations, communism and capitalism, the New Deal and its foes. Write and produce a short play which will bring into bold relief the day's news of one or more of these conflicts. Express the tragic as well as the comic elements which really exist in a concrete situation—the hypnosis of a single point of view, with its concomitant dogmatism, fanaticism, and violence.

2. Many organizations with divergent theories and remedies are sincerely anxious to help preserve the best in American traditions, principles, and ideals. Some of these are the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Legion, the Descendents of the American Revolution, the Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution. Just what are the traditions which these groups wish to preserve? What methods are they using? Are they using methods consistent with the traditions they wish to keep? Discuss the traditions which your group wishes to emphasize. What methods and which propagandas are consistent with these? Which are not? Can you separate the methods you use from the goals you desire? Specifically, can you attain democracy by undemocratic methods? What is the function of propaganda in the kind of a democracy you desire?

3. In our national life, one of the times when propaganda is particularly rife, when there are greater conflicts and sharper expressions of opinion, is during a Presidential election. Then all the propaganda devices are used. Prepare yourself and your group for the next national election. Frame a list of questions to ask candidates. Study the work of this kind done by the League of Women Voters. If possible, bring together on the same platform two candidates for the same office. Inquire into their past

the collapse of the Soviet dictatorship, the destruction of Moscow, and the victory of the White Armies for the sixth or seventh time, however, American newspaper editors began to suspect that Riga, while undoubtedly their most prolific source of Soviet news, was probably not their most reliable. They began to call it "the Riga lie-factory," and they ordered their correspondents to Moscow.

Of all the great news-gathering agencies, only two — *The Times,* of London, and the Chicago Tribune-N. Y. News Syndicate Co., Inc. — still keep top-notch men at Riga, still rely upon it for their Soviet news. Last month, the Chicago *Tribune* correspondent, Donald Day, had this story to report: Workers in the Josef Stalin Automobile Works had risen in revolt against the Soviet régime; after demolishing the machines, and setting the factory afire, they had erected barricades and fought a pitched battle with members of the Moscow Fire Department and the G. P. U.; an undetermined number had been killed, and 3,000 were under arrest.

As far as the Institute has been able to determine, few American news editors bothered to ask their Moscow correspondents to check Mr. Day's story. One, who did, received the laconic reply: "Huh?"

∽

Legion While the National Education Association was meeting in New York last month, Professor William Gellermann's thesis, *The American Legion as Educator,* was published by the Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University. It was immediately charged that some one at Teachers College wanted to embarrass the N. E. A. by giving newspaper readers the impression that the N. E. A. was in some way responsible for Professor Gellermann's study. On the contrary, the New York *Times'* page-one story about the dissertation appeared on the opening day of the educators' convention simply because the books went on sale that day. Teachers College had expected that the books would be ready for sale as early as May 15; but delays at the bindery made delivery coincide with the opening of the convention. The coincidence was not premeditated; it was sheer accident.

Actually Dr. Gellermann finished his thesis last summer. At that time New York reporters were told about the story. A New York *Post* reporter was asked to write the story. After the assistant city editor had discussed the study with the managing editor, however, the order was countermanded.

Also, the New York *Times* and *Herald Tribune* correspondents saw hot news in Gellermann's study and told their superiors about it. But no story appeared in either paper.

Still later, another *Post* reporter brought the study to his city editor's attention. It was killed again. Still no story.

Finally, in May, 1938, Professor Gellermann's thesis was announced for publication, and reporters were informed that it would be publicized in the routine manner on publication date.

It was only by coincidence that Professor Gellermann's book came from the printers when it did. A *Times* reporter wrote two columns about it at the request of his editors. The *Times,* previously cold to Gellermann's study, now decided to play it on page one.

The next day the *Times* attacked the study. The *Post* and the *Herald Tribune,* which had ignored the study in their news columns, praised it loudly.

Thus far, the controversy over the Gellermann analysis of the Legion has taken chiefly the form of name calling. Few of those who have attacked Professor Gellermann bothered to read his book or answer his specific charges. They have shouted; "Crackpot, red, Communist, un-American, libel, Moscow, jackass, puny mind, fly-speck." Of course, Professor Gellermann was guilty of name calling himself when he spoke of the Legion as being "potentially fascist" and linked it with such organizations as the Black Legion. However, as Professor Gellermann later pointed out in a letter to the *Times,* his conclusions were based upon long research and "factual evidence."

Dr. Gellermann's letter to the *Times,* incidentally, was probably responsible for Ralph Thompson's highly favorable book review which appeared in the same issue.

∽

Tit for Tat "Oil and 'the More Abundant Life' . . . an Epic for America's Newspaper Readers."

Under this streamer last month eighteen newspaper publishers, including Frank E. Gannett, of the powerful Gannett chain, and J. Noel Macy, of the Westchester Newspapers, seven influential dailies in New York's opulent

Westchester County, told readers of *Editor and Publisher* the story of the petroleum industry — as the petroleum industry prefers to have it told:

Nearly fourteen billion dollars have been invested by two million Americans in the petroleum industry. One million employés receive $1,500,000,000 in wages from it every year; eleven million workers are dependent upon it, either directly or indirectly, for their living. Direct taxes on gasoline alone totaled $964,000,000 in 1937.

Mr. Gannett and his fellow-publishers painted their rosy picture in two pages of paid advertising, splattered with photos of battleships, tractors, airplanes, streamlined locomotives, oil wells, and trucks. And they concluded: "Every citizen . . . should be acquainted with all of the facts of this great industry upon which his maximum earning power, the health and education of his family, present and future comforts and pleasures, as well as safety in time of war, are so dependent."

The petroleum industry, they said, is "one to foster and protect for the good of all America." No citizen, once he knew the facts, could fail to realize that.

Anyone who might have wondered at the action of the publishers in buying two pages of *Editor and Publisher* to proclaim their reverence for the petroleum industry would have found the answer to his bewilderment in the final paragraph of the ad. The publishers, he would have learned, were inviting American industry to place institutional advertising in their papers — advertising that would present industry's point of view on the economic problems that now face the nation.

It need hardly be said that any industrialist would hesitate to put such ads in newspapers that were giving their readers another picture of American industry than his. So the publishers had decided to assure the industrialist that he needn't worry: they realized no less fully than he, "what can be accomplished by individual enterprise, under the American system [ah! Glittering Generality!], in the satisfaction of human needs."

The newspapers, which are so eager to present industry's story, include the Boston *Globe,* Chicago *Tribune,* Cincinnati *Enquirer,* Cleveland *Press,* Columbus *Dispatch,* Fall River *Herald News,* Gannett Newspapers, Harrisburg *Patriot & News,* Johnstown *Democrat,* Johnstown *Tribune,* Louisville *Courier-Journal,* Louisville *Times,* New York *Sun,* Pittsburgh *Press,* Scranton *Times,* Washington *Star,* Westchester Newspapers, and Youngstown *Vindicator.*

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES AND DISCUSSION NOTES

1. In a civilization as complex and as fraught with conflicting propagandas and theories as ours, we frequently forget the cathartic value of laughter, particularly of laughter at ourselves, at our strong prejudices, theories, and assumptions, at their illogic and inconsistencies. An interesting experiment is to see what drama and laughter can do to propaganda. Study cartoons, editorials, letters, speeches, and other forms of the most extreme expressions of violent partisanship in such conflicts as those between the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O., capital and labor, democratic and dictatorial nations, communism and capitalism, the New Deal and its foes. Write and produce a short play which will bring into bold relief the day's news of one or more of these conflicts. Express the tragic as well as the comic elements which really exist in a concrete situation—the hypnosis of a single point of view, with its concomitant dogmatism, fanaticism, and violence.

2. Many organizations with divergent theories and remedies are sincerely anxious to help preserve the best in American traditions, principles, and ideals. Some of these are the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Legion, the Descendents of the American Revolution, the Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution. Just what are the traditions which these groups wish to preserve? What methods are they using? Are they using methods consistent with the traditions they wish to keep? Discuss the traditions which your group wishes to emphasize. What methods and which propagandas are consistent with these? Which are not? Can you separate the methods you use from the goals you desire? Specifically, can you attain democracy by undemocratic methods? What is the function of propaganda in the kind of a democracy you desire?

3. In our national life, one of the times when propaganda is particularly rife, when there are greater conflicts and sharper expressions of opinion, is during a Presidential election. Then all the propaganda devices are used. Prepare yourself and your group for the next national election. Frame a list of questions to ask candidates. Study the work of this kind done by the League of Women Voters. If possible, bring together on the same platform two candidates for the same office. Inquire into their past

legislative records. Learn about lobbies and pressure groups. Break down the Glittering Generalities used. Determine the meaning of the "bad" names used in the campaign. Find out where the "cards have been stacked" for or against a particular proposal. Are the members of your group getting onto the "band wagon" simply because it is the thing to do or have they thought through the specific issues in the campaign? Make a list of these issues and from speeches, editorials, correspondence, and other sources determine how the candidates would vote and what action they would take. Rank the issues in order of importance, then rank the candidates.

Volume II OCTOBER 1, 1938 *Number 1*

News from Europe

THE print is hardly dry on your newspaper when already the headlines seem old, stale, meaningless. Crisis follows crisis, incident crowds on incident – all with such dizzy speed that you sometimes feel as though one split-second alone may stand between war in Europe, and peace. Only seven months have passed since Reichsfuehrer Adolf Hitler stood in Vienna, in the shadow of Nazi guns, and proclaimed *Anschluss.* Today, his troops are massed along the Czech frontier. Tomorrow – well, anything can happen tomorrow. In the propagandist-training schools of Nazi Germany, where youngsters are taught how to mold public opinion as though it were fresh-smelling clay, the chief topic of conversation is now Rumania. Students are learning how to stir up pro-Nazi feeling in Rumania – just as Germany did in Austria before *Anschluss,* just as Germany did in Sudetenland before Hitler announced that Sudetenland also must be his.

Offhand, it would therefore seem that Rumania is next on Hitler's list.

Events move swiftly in Europe today, and trans-Atlantic cables hum as never before since the Versailles Treaty. Never before has so much been written about Europe, nor so much said. And never before has there been so much confusion about what is actually happening there. One bulletin contradicts another; one interpretive story contradicts the next.

Of course, some things are clear. Germany's *Drang nach Osten* is under way again. Its goal is the Ukraine. That much – the bare outline – is evident.[1] And, the only question is: Will Germany be stopped?

Day-to-day events, however, are more obscure. On Monday, September 19, for example, John T. Whitaker, of the Chicago *Daily News,* reported from Prague that Czechoslovakia was defiant, that she would fight to her last man. That very day, in the very same edition, however, M. W. Fodor, another *Daily News* man in Prague, reported that Czechoslovakia was backing down. Later came the report from London that Czechoslovakia had surrendered to Hitler's demands. Yet, on Wednesday morning, G. E. R. Gedye, of the New York *Times,* cabled that England and France had renewed their pressure on Czechoslovakia to surrender; the report from London, he said, was an outright "lie."

Similarly, on the same day that Ferdinand Kuhn, Jr., of the New York *Times,* reported from London that England and France had capitulated to Hitler, Mr. Gedye reported from Prague that France undoubtedly would stand by her treaty with the Czechs.

Was there ever any doubt that England and France would capitulate to Hitler? Perhaps there was. On the other hand, it may very well be that Neville Chamberlain and Edouard Daladier had made their decision even before Chamberlain's first visit to Hitler, before the disorders in Sudetenland or Henlein's ultimatum to Czechoslovakia – before Hitler's Nuremberg speech, in fact. Way back in May, Constantine Brown wrote in his syndicated Washington column that England and France

[1] It has been evident for some time. In the May issue of PROPAGANDA ANALYSIS, "Propaganda Techniques of German Fascism," the Institute predicted: "Meanwhile, German Fascist propaganda may be expected increasingly to penetrate other lands: in some countries, such as Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania, as preparation for *Anschluss;* elsewhere as a means of obtaining open or tacit approval of such German Fascist expansion."

had already "sealed the fate of Czechoslovakia." And Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Paris correspondent of the Chicago *Daily News,* was assured during the first week of September that Czechoslovakia had been "sold down the river."

Why this confusion? How do reputable American newspapers happen to print reports that are later revealed as lies? Faced with so many contradictory reports, what can we believe?

In the game of diplomacy, that government is strongest which has public opinion behind it. A government which doesn't have the support of its people starts with two strikes against it. Hostile world opinion can mean defeat. It is, therefore, only natural that governments should befog their every move in propaganda; that governments should attempt to color the news, twist fact into fiction and fiction into fact.

One tool which makes this possible is censorship. Germany, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Japan, the Soviet Union – all censor news dispatches. Of course, the extent of censorship varies from country to country, and even in the same country at different times. A month ago, Czechoslovakia made almost no attempt to censor the cables. As this is written, the censorship is very strict. On the other hand, the German censor does not bother even to read dispatches before they are sent. The correspondent puts his story on the cables, then lets the censor read the carbons. If the story is considered unfriendly to Adolf Hitler, the censor may warn the correspondent to watch his step. If the correspondent persists in sending unfriendly stories, he will find that his news-sources are closed to him; party and government officials will refuse to speak to him; government bureaus will refuse to give him information. Later may come expulsion from the country.

In the Soviet Union, the censor reads everything. He bluepencils dispatches, and sometimes he will even censor them in their entirety. Often, however, the correspondent will be permitted to send the story with this note: "The Soviet censor will not let me say that. . . . " Dispatches which begin with that phrase are never printed: they are cabled by the correspondent for his editor's personal information, and to guide him in his editorial policy.

Censorship, however, is not the foreign propagandist's only tool. Where can the correspondent in Europe get his facts? Here in the United States the correspondent for (let us say) the official German news agency can find out what is happening by reading newspapers and magazines of every shade: Republican, New Deal, Socialist, Communist, Fascist; checking one against the other. If there is any doubt about certain government statistics the opposition parties will be sure to point that out. Nobody will have any hesitation in talking with the correspondent, from the man in the street to high government officials, for in this country they don't throw you in jail for talking.

In Germany, however, the American correspondent faces another situation entirely. He reads the papers: in fact, he gets most of his information from them. Unfortunately, he can learn from them only what the government wants the German people to know, for the press of Germany is strictly regulated. During the past month the German press has been full of atrocity stories: Hitler apparently wants to stir his people to hatred against the Czechs. The German press has also been full of reports that Soviet troops are being sent to Czechoslovakia: Hitler, of course, likes to mask his every action with anti-Communist slogans. "I saved Europe from Communism" is his propaganda stock-in-trade. Many of these stories have been cabled to America: the correspondents knew that some of them were out-and-out lies, that others had only the barest relation to fact. Nevertheless, they felt that Americans should know what the Nazi government was saying about the Sudeten crisis.

Government statistics are hard to get in Germany, and those you do get may be doctored. The correspondent never really knows for sure because there are no opposition statistics. As for talking freely with people whom he meets, that is manifestly impossible. People won't talk freely with foreigners, except in praise of the government – not as long as Germany has its Gestapo.

News from Europe, by its very nature, is generally of the it-was-learned-from-an-official-source variety. Diplomats will talk, but rarely for direct quotation: that might cause trouble with another power. Correspondents will occasionally get information from their friends; but they can't reveal the source of that information, not if they value their friends' safety.

This makes the job of the foreign propagandist almost ridiculously easy. He whispers his propaganda stories into the ear of the American correspondent, then sits back and waits to

read them in the American press. No responsibility can be pinned on him. As long as the correspondent must come to him for information, he can flood America with propaganda.

Pick up any newspaper today and read the dispatches from Europe. Many of the most important will be ascribed to mysterious "official" sources. "A man who saw . . . Adolf Hitler's memorandum to Prime Minister Chamberlain today said that it was most conciliatory in tone . . . " (The memorandum was later made public; and there was nothing conciliatory about it.) Now these mystery-men, who generally are members of the diplomatic corps, sometimes give the correspondents accurate, unbiased information. Sometimes, but not always. The London dispatch that Czechoslovakia had surrendered to Germany, which so enraged Mr. Gedye, for example, was "learned here today from an official source." Whoever planted the story on American newspapermen did so, apparently, with the hope of forcing Czechoslovakia's hand, for, as was evidenced by later developments, some English diplomats were piqued no end by Czechoslovakia's delay in committing national suicide.

Last May, the chancelleries of Europe were panicked by the report that Germany was mobilizing to invade Czechoslovakia. The story came originally from Prague; it was relayed to America by English diplomats in Germany and London. In his Nuremberg address last month, Adolf Hitler charged that it was false; and it may be that Herr Hitler, who is quite an expert at lying himself and makes no bones about it (see *Mein Kampf*), was right. The London *News-Chronicle* thinks so, although it recently praised the Foreign Office for its acumen in spreading the story. Frank C. Hanighen, the journalist, was in Germany when the story broke, and he thinks so, too. He says: "I know of no (foreign) observer who believes that the Germans were mobilizing to attack Czechoslovakia – and some of the embassies tapped unusual sources of information and made intensive investigations before arriving at this conclusion."

Later, there was another report that German troops were getting ready to invade Sudetenland. This one actually set the date of the invasion: August 15. Newspapers headlined it. Walter Winchell barked it over the air. As the world now knows, August 15 came and went, Germany did not march.

The report was started by Genevieve Tabouis, of the French newspaper, *L'Oeuvre*. It was picked up shortly afterward by *The Week*, of London, then broadcast throughout America. Genevieve Tabouis and Maxim Litvinoff, the Soviet Foreign Commissar, are close friends; she also has many friends at the Quai d'Orsay. It has been suggested by some newspapermen that either M. Litvinoff or else the Quai d'Orsay planted the story on her in order to embarrass Herr Hitler, reasoning that when Germany failed to march on August 15, the world probably would feel that England, France, and the Soviet Union – the so-called democratic bloc of nations – had won another diplomatic victory over Germany and the Fascist axis. This, it was hoped, would strengthen the sentiment for collective action, these newspapermen maintain.

On the other hand, one New York cable editor, at least, believes that Germany encourages newspaper stories that she is getting ready to march, and surreptitiously helps to spread them. He says that Germany doesn't want to fight, that Germany can't fight, that Germany counts on getting her way by threats. Newspaper stories of German mobilization, if they are believed, can be even more threatening, he says, than ultimata. He does not believe that Mlle. Tabouis got her story from German diplomats, merely that German diplomats encouraged it, hoping to use it for their own propaganda ends.

The idea of inspiring fake mobilization stories in order to intimidate other nations is hardly new. In the midst of the Ethiopian invasion, when there was talk in the League of Nations of cutting off Italy's oil-supply, the Italian Foreign Office inspired one that nearly threw England into panic. It was the story about Italy's "Squadron of Death," aviators, who (it was learned from an official source) had offered to crash their planes into England's Mediterranean fleet and wipe it out, if oil sanctions were declared.

Still another factor operates to color the news from Europe. The newspaper correspondent must stay on good terms with government officials, since he gets so many of his stories from them. Consequently, he may at times have to slant his story to avoid offending them. He plays ball with them, and they play ball with him. That's how newspapermen must work.

Now the American newspaperman is the most indefatigable news-gatherer in the world. If the facts can be gotten, he'll get them. He'll

write the story as objectively as possible (for, with few notable exceptions, American newspapermen are not propagandists.) Still, the cards are stacked against him. In fact, under the circumstances, the high level of the average foreign correspondent's work is truly remarkable.

It should be remembered, moreover, that all the reporters who cover Europe for the American press are not Americans. Newspapers sometimes find it necessary to hire Europeans. And the Europeans, while they way be well versed in the language, customs, and history of their country, and while they may have innumerable news-sources, developed through many years of newspaper work, nevertheless can hardly be expected to write objectively. Sometimes, it would seem, they can't even write. A German was United Press correspondent in Munich last spring when Hitler ordered his army to advance on Austria. He notified his editors that German troops were moving southward — then, nothing was heard from him. The United Press was frantic. Here was the biggest story of the year. For dozens of newspapers which use the U. P., press-time was rolling around. Yet, there was no word from Munich. Finally, word came: the correspondent had been ordered to join his regiment, and he could not, therefore, cover the invasion. He was going to participate in the invasion, himself.

The United Press was beaten on the story — not badly, for it had other ways to get the news — but that is not the point. Suppose the correspondent *had* been able to cover the invasion: how could he possibly have been expected to report it without bias, particularly with the shadow of the prison camp looming beside him?

During the next few months, the news from Europe may become even more bewildering than it has been heretofore. Certainly, the nations of Europe can be expected to intensify their efforts to color news dispatches, to flood the cables with propaganda stories. In England, for example, there has long been talk of starting an intensive propaganda campaign to counteract the isolationist feeling in the United States; and now, in view of the wave of revulsion that swept the American press at what the papers chose to call "the betrayal" and "the sell-out" of Czechoslovakia, it seems likely that something may soon be done.

For, if England goes to war, she'll do her best to gain America's support. England believes, as C. V. R. Thompson, New York correspondent of the London *Evening Standard,* wrote only the other day, that "America is strictly isolationist, strictly pacific, and concerned only with the welfare of herself and her neighbors." As Mr. Thompson hastened to add, however, England also believes that "Emotionalism fanned by propaganda sent (America) to help democracy once before. Some bands and some parades, an incident or two like the sinking of a British liner or the bombing of London might cause her to change her mind again."

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES AND DISCUSSION NOTES

I. Why are the nations of Europe so concerned with what Americans think of the European situation? What attitudes do you think Americans have toward the European crisis? On what facts do you base your opinions? What attitudes do you think each of the following governments wants America to adopt toward Europe's present conflicts: England, France, Italy, Germany, the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia?

II. How was emotional feeling whipped up in America before and after our entrance into the World War in 1917? Consider how propaganda is used to "get people ready to fight." Bibliography suggestions here include, Walter Millis' *The Road to War* and O. W. Riegel's *Mobilizing for Chaos.*

Following suggestions given in the bound copy of Volume I of Propaganda Analysis, examine your own emotions concerning the present European crisis. Are you partisan? Why? How does your fear of war affect your view of the situation in Europe?

III. People who listened to Adolf Hitler's Nuremberg and Berlin addresses over the radio and then read the full text in their newspapers the following day, were impressed by the fact that statements which seemed relatively unexciting in print sounded harsh, threatening, and packed with menace when spoken.

What effects do voice tone and quality, and rhythm patterns of speech have upon radio listeners?

Take down a few excitement-packed sentences concerning the European crisis. Deliver these sentences, first in a monotone, then as dramatically and forcefully as you can. Make notes of the propaganda devices used in radio oratory. Discuss them.

IV. The Chicago *Daily News* said recently that propaganda was Reichsfuehrer Hitler's "deadliest weapon."

Specifically, what does this statement mean? Con-

sider such questions as: (1) Wherein lie the differences between propaganda in Germany and propaganda in the United States and other democratic nations? (2) Does the Nazi propaganda machine give Adolf Hitler the upper hand in negotiations with the democratic nations? If so, why? If not, why not? (3) When German newspapers clamor hysterically for action on some particular issue what inferences can we draw about the plans of the Nazi government? (See the May issue of PROPAGANDA ANALYSIS.)

V. Consider the question of censorship as propaganda. Discuss why nations have censors. George Seldes' *You Can't Print That* should be helpful to the group leader in planning his discussion outline.

VI. Pick up today's newspaper. Look at a news story datelined Berlin on the disorders in Sudetenland.

Consider the source of the story. Does the factor of the city or country from which the story is filed affect the story in any way? How? Was the news story ascribed to any person in particular? Was the story written by the reporter on the basis of his own observation? On documentary evidence? On an interview? If so, was "the authority" named? If the name of the person is withheld at his request, what do you think he sought to achieve by asking that his name be withheld?

Suppose another reporter in Prague were recounting the same event. Is there any possibility that his version might differ from that of the German correspondent? How might it differ? Why?